



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 20, 2022

No. 13

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Light of the world, shine Your love on us this day. Break forth into the darkness of our world with Your truth and illuminate the paths You would have us take as we move through this day.

Make visible to us Your abiding presence, that in the certainty of Your company we would be more willing to go forth, step up, and speak Your life-giving word into the uncertainty of these times.

Reveal to us Your redeeming will, that we would receive the righteousness You offer us. May our personal holiness be grounded in humility and motivated by our desire to serve You.

Thus, may Your light shine unobscured through our renewed commitment to this world, our country, and Your people. May we have the eyes to see those who are in need, and may our lives reflect the warmth of Your light on those who hide in despair.

This day, may our words, our deeds, and our relationships one with another, be a witness to Your light and Your love.

In the gift of Your revealed name we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to section 11(a) of House Resolution 188, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN)

come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. DEAN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CONGRATULATING CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL OF PHILADELPHIA

(Ms. DEAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DEAN. Madam Speaker, I congratulate and thank the Children's Hospital of Philadelphia on the opening of their second inpatient hospital, in my district, in King of Prussia.

CHOP's Middleman Family Pavilion will dedicate more than 250,000 square feet of space solely to children. In our continued fight with COVID-19, we need more facilities like this one that families from all over our region can access.

As the first pediatric emergency room in Montgomery County, CHOP will ensure that more children in Pennsylvania will have timely, nationally acclaimed care.

The Middleman Family Pavilion will also create many jobs for the Montgomery County community, bringing needed jobs to communities like Norristown, Bridgeport, and Conshohocken.

Now more than ever, with CHOP, it is all about children. That is the same for me. We need healthcare facilities that meet the demands of today, that treat our children with expert care and our families with compassion. Congratulations to CHOP.

A LOT CAN HAPPEN IN A YEAR

(Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, a lot can happen in a year: a woman can deliver a newborn; a child can learn to walk; and a small virus leaked from a lab in Wuhan, China, can go around the globe and cause a global pandemic.

While the first two are joyous, the latter, and the 1-year anniversary of the Biden administration, is nothing to celebrate. We have the highest inflation in 40 years, and you don't need a graph to show that. We see it each day when we go to fill up our tank or go to the grocery store.

We have the end of American energy independence and a plea to OPEC to increase petroleum production; record-high numbers of illegal border crossings; almost double legal immigration, with no COVID-19 testing; record-high illegal drug crossings, especially synthetic fentanyl, with record-high overdoses, especially in our young population, 18 to 45; record-high homicides and crime in blue States; a disastrous withdrawal from Afghanistan, Saigon 2.0, with a loss of billions in equipment and the lives of 13 of our servicemen and -women.

The disastrous withdrawal from Afghanistan has led to increased instability with Russia and China.

We have a vaccine mandate that ignores science, which shows that both the delta virus can transmit, even if vaccinated and boosted, and omicron wanes within 1 month.

My advice to this administration: End the vaccine mandate; stop what you are doing; and go on vacation.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H255

SUPPORTING CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL FOR IRAN HOSTAGES

(Mr. SUOZZI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the award of a Congressional Gold Medal to the 52 hostages of the Iran hostage crisis that were released, after 444 days of captivity, 41 years ago today.

On November 4, 1979, Iranian student militants stormed the U.S. Embassy in Tehran and took Embassy employees captive. Despite mock firing squads, beatings, solitary confinement, lack of food, and psychological torture, the American hostages maintained their strength and resilience.

Back at home, Americans remained united in their support for the hostages, many tying yellow ribbons around trees as a sign of solidarity. The former hostages have never received proper recognition from their government for their sacrifices.

This bipartisan bill is a symbol of our Nation's ability to come together to honor these American heroes. As of today, the bill has over 166 cosponsors.

Special thanks to Commission 52 and Chairman Brock Pierce for helping to gather support for the bill. It is a true public service.

PRESIDENT BIDEN DRAGGING COUNTRY BACKWARD

(Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this week marks 1 year of President Biden's out-of-touch, reckless, and disastrous Presidency.

The past 12 months have been filled with failure after failure, and Americans are dealing with the consequences at every corner.

From skyrocketing inflation, increased crime rates, a disastrous Afghanistan exit, an open border agenda, concerned parents labeled as domestic terrorists, and more, this administration has failed the American people.

Amidst all the crises, President Biden has spent a quarter of his first year in his Delaware basement, avoiding all responsibilities. This is unacceptable from anyone.

I came to Congress to serve the people of Texas' 25th Congressional District, and when I am back home, I hear firsthand how Texans are worse off under President Biden than ever before.

The bottom line is, a year of the Biden administration's socialist and far-left agenda has dragged our country backward, not forward.

It is time America has leaders that put America first. President Joe Biden is not that leader. He has 33 percent approval.

In God we trust.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STANTON). Members are reminded to re-

frain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

CELEBRATING FEDERAL FUNDING TO EXPAND HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL

(Ms. GARCIA of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the Federal dollars coming to the Houston area to solve the supply chain issues facing our community and to create more jobs.

Yesterday, the Biden administration announced over \$14 billion for projects that will improve our Nation's ports, waterways, and railroads. That includes \$147 million for a project to expand the Houston Ship Channel on the way to the Port of Houston.

This project will make it easier for ships to reach the docks and help more cargo move faster from the container ship to the store shelf. This will create jobs, jobs, and more jobs. This is huge for Texas, huge for Houston, and huge for the whole country.

Thanks to the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act passed by this Chamber, we are solving the real problems facing everyday Americans.

I am grateful for the leadership of President Biden and my colleagues in Congress for getting this done.

REPUBLICANS WILLING TO WORK WITH PRESIDENT BIDEN

(Mr. GROTHMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I listened last night to President Biden's press conference, and I was disappointed that he felt the Republicans did not want to work with him.

I would like to open the door, first of all, to working together to balance the budget. We don't consider it a goal of ours to race to get to \$30 trillion in debt.

Please, Mr. Biden, convene a group of Republicans and Democrats. Let's work together to balance the budget.

Secondly, prior to you taking office, it was routine that about 20,000 people per month came across the border. Now, we are at over 80,000.

I secondly ask that we convene a bipartisan group to get back down to 20,000 a month to cross the border.

Finally, at the time President Trump was President, he was given a cocktail which cured his COVID illness almost immediately. That cocktail should be available to all Americans.

I, again, encourage a joint conference with us to get together and cure the people who get COVID.

Finally, Mr. President, stop being so divisive and screaming racism right and left. It does no good for this body to constantly call racism.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

IMPROVING MERRILL AND RING CREEK BRIDGE

(Mr. LARSEN of Washington asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, people have been traveling across the Merrill and Ring Creek Bridge in Everett, Washington, since Herbert Hoover was President of the United States.

Every day, residents drive, walk, pedal, and roll across the bridge to get to and from work and school in Everett and to catch a ferry in Mukilteo. Commuters on Everett Transit's route 18 bus rely on the bridge to access Sounder commuter rail and Amtrak service at Everett Station.

However, a recent assessment revealed the bridge is not only structurally deficient; it is vulnerable to collapse in the event of an earthquake. Thanks to the bipartisan infrastructure law, Washington communities will receive more than \$605 million over the next 5 years to invest in critical bridge repairs.

Last week, Everett officials took me across the Merrill and Ring Creek Bridge and told me how this bold, long-term investment will create jobs, drive economic recovery, and keep people on the move.

Mr. Speaker, you cannot have a big-league economy with little-league infrastructure. Thanks to the bipartisan infrastructure law, communities in my district now have the resources needed to repair aging bridges and build a winning game plan for the region's economic future.

RECOGNIZING STETSON BENNETT

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize one of the First District's finest, quarterback Stetson Bennett of the Georgia Bulldogs.

Football is filled with stories of triumph, tribulation, and heart. The saga of Stetson Bennett has now cemented itself as one of those great stories that football fans will talk about for generations.

Hailing from Blackshear, Georgia, in Pierce County, Stetson Bennett grew up with a dream and a drive to turn that dream into reality.

As a young quarterback at Pierce County High School, Stetson was able to accumulate 3,700 passing yards, 500 rushing yards, and 40 touchdowns, along with Class 3A second team all-State honors.

Despite his accomplishments, Stetson was overlooked by many top football programs, but he never gave up the dream and walked on at the University of Georgia.

Following his freshman year, he chose to transfer to a junior college,

where he went 10–2 and won a championship. He returned to the University of Georgia his junior year and earned a starting role.

This past season, Stetson Bennett spearheaded the Dawgs to their first college football national championship in 42 years. The dream has become reality.

Stetson inspires me and will inspire others for many years to come.

Congratulations, and go Dawgs.

HONORING THE LIFE OF OFFICER BOBBY REED

(Mr. CORREA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, today, we honor the life and memory of Officer Bobby Reed.

He was born November 23, 1951, and Bobby Reed's life was about service to his community and to his country.

As a marine, he was deployed overseas to Vietnam, where he served honorably and attained the rank of staff sergeant.

When he returned home to Santa Ana, California, my hometown, he decided to join the local police department to continue protecting and serving his community.

During his 28 years of service on the Santa Ana police force, Officer Reed was honored many times over by his colleagues and his community for his exemplary service and character. Multiple civic organizations, such as Kiwanis and MADD, recognized him with many awards.

He was also elected as a board member of the Santa Ana Police Officers Association, showing, again, his leadership and his positive influence on others.

As we celebrate Bobby's life, may his example continue to shine for the next generation.

□ 0915

SPEAKER PHELAN SETS THE BAR HIGH

(Mr. WEBER of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the 76th Speaker of the Texas House of Representatives, Representative Dade Phelan of Beaumont, Texas.

Speaker Phelan, who is serving his fourth term representing the great District 21, is one of the most conservative Speakers in our State's history and has made it his priority to significantly improve the lives of Texans every single day.

As only the fourth Republican to hold the Texas House Speakership since 1871, or 151 years, he has set the bar high for any who might follow in his footsteps. He fought to pass landmark legislation that protects businesses, taxpayers, the unborn, religious

freedoms, and our Second Amendment rights.

Under his leadership, the Texas House led on criminal justice reform issues, healthcare affordability, police funding, and addressing winter storm Uri's long-term impact on our State.

I cannot express how proud we are in Texas 14 to claim Speaker Phelan, his wife Kim, and their four precious boys, Ford, Mack, Hank, and little Luke, as our own.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Speaker Phelan for all he does for Texas.

ENSURING VETERANS' SMOOTH TRANSITION ACT

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 860, I call up the bill (H.R. 4673) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the automatic enrollment of eligible veterans in patient enrollment system of Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 860, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117–26 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 4673

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Ensuring Veterans' Smooth Transition Act" or the "EVEST Act".

SEC. 2. AUTOMATIC ENROLLMENT OF ELIGIBLE VETERANS IN PATIENT ENROLLMENT SYSTEM OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 1705 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d)(1) *The Secretary shall enroll each veteran described in subsection (a) in the patient enrollment system under this section by not later than 60 days after receiving the information described in paragraph (3) with respect to the veteran.*

“(2) *Not later than 60 days after enrolling a veteran under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall provide to the veteran—*

“(A) *notice of the veteran's enrollment; and*

“(B) *instructions for how the veteran may opt out of such enrollment, at the election of the veteran.*

“(3) *The information described in this paragraph is the appropriate information concerning eligibility for enrollment in the patient enrollment system under this section, as provided by the Defense Manpower Data Center of the Department of Defense, or such successor entity of the Department.*”.

(b) *APPLICABILITY.*—Subsection (d) of section 1705 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply to a veteran with respect to whom the Secretary receives the information described in paragraph (3) of such subsection on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) *ELECTRONIC CERTIFICATES OF ELIGIBILITY FOR DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS PATIENT ENROLLMENT SYSTEM.*—Not later than August 1, 2022, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs

shall ensure that any veteran who is eligible for automatic enrollment in the patient enrollment system under subsection (d) of section 1705 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), is able to access—

(1) *an electronic version of the certificate of eligibility showing the veteran's eligibility for such enrollment; and*

(2) *an electronic mechanism by which the veteran may opt out of such enrollment.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, is debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs or their respective designees.

The gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 4673, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4673, as amended, my bill, the Ensuring Veterans' Smooth Transition, or EVEST Act.

I have made suicide prevention a top priority for the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. Last Congress, we passed bipartisan, bicameral mental health legislative packages, including the Commander John Scott Hannon Veterans Mental Health Improvement Act and the Veterans COMPACT Act. This Congress, we continued this work by passing the Sergeant Ketchum Rural Veterans Mental Health Act into law, but there is always more to do.

EVEST builds on our work and finally closes one of the most glaring gaps for veterans being able to successfully access high-quality VA health services, the enrollment process. We shouldn't be trying to hide VA care from those who earned it.

We know that the months following transition out of the military can be very stressful and particularly risky for new veterans in terms of mental health. With the EVEST Act, service-members will be automatically enrolled in VA care during their transition out of the military, with the choice to opt out. This helps simplify the process and prevents veterans from potentially missing out on lifesaving care. It also keeps veterans from having to opt into VA care later and attempt to navigate a new bureaucracy all on their own.

The symptoms of PTSD can be significantly improved in veterans who receive prompt mental healthcare. A 2014 study led by researchers at the San Francisco VA Medical Center looked at nearly 40,000 Iraq and Afghanistan veterans who received VA mental

healthcare between 2001 and 2011 and had a post-deployment diagnosis of PTSD. They found that veterans who sought and received care soon after the end of their service had lower levels of PTSD upon follow-up a year after they initiated care. Each year that a veteran waited to initiate treatment, there was about a 5 percent increase in the odds of their PTSD either not improving or getting worse.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the study from the San Francisco VA Medical Center.

[From Psychiatric Services, Dec. 2014]

TIMING OF MENTAL HEALTH TREATMENT AND PTSD SYMPTOM IMPROVEMENT AMONG IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN VETERANS

(By Shira Maguen, Ph.D.; Erin Madden, M.P.H.; Thomas C. Neylan, M.D.; Beth E. Cohen, M.D., M.A.S.; Daniel Bertenthal, M.P.H.; Karen H. Seal, M.D., M.P.H.)

OBJECTIVE

This study examined demographic, military, temporal, and logistic variables associated with improvement of posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) among Iraq and Afghanistan veterans who received mental health outpatient treatment from the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) health care system. The authors sought to determine whether time between last deployment and initiating mental health treatment was associated with a lack of improvement in PTSD symptoms.

METHODS

The authors conducted a retrospective analysis of existing medical records of Iraq and Afghanistan veterans who enrolled in VA health care, received a postdeployment PTSD diagnosis, and initiated treatment for one or more mental health problems between October 1, 2007, and December 31, 2011, and whose records contained results of PTSD screening at the start of treatment and approximately one year later (N=39,690).

RESULTS

At the start of treatment, 75% of veterans diagnosed as having PTSD had a positive PTSD screen. At follow-up, 27% of those with a positive screen at baseline had improved, and 43% of those with a negative screen at baseline remained negative. A negative PTSD screen at follow-up was associated with female gender, older age, white race, having never married, officer rank, non-Army service, closer proximity to the nearest VA facility, and earlier initiation of treatment after the end of the last deployment.

CONCLUSIONS

Interventions to reduce delays in initiating mental health treatment may improve veterans' treatment response. Further studies are needed to test interventions for particular veteran subgroups who were less likely than others to improve with treatment. (Psychiatric Services 65:1414-1419, 2014; doi: 10.1176/appi.ps.201300453)

Posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) is one of the most common mental disorders among veterans returning from recent deployments. Yet, despite the availability of evidence-based treatments, there are multiple barriers to initiating mental health treatment. Many military personnel and veterans who report barriers to mental health care do not seek treatment or postpone seeking it.

Among veterans who do seek mental health care, the time lag is quite significant. In a previous study, we found that recently returning veterans with psychiatric diag-

noses had delayed initiating mental health care at the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) by a median of over two years after their last deployment ended. Delays in care can translate into delays in symptom and functional improvement, hindering readjustment to civilian life, family, and community.

Some studies have examined predictors of PTSD symptom worsening, but outside of randomized treatment trials, only a few studies have examined variables that are associated with PTSD symptom improvement. In other words, few studies have examined variables that are associated with PTSD symptom improvement in a naturalistic fashion, by allowing treatment initiation or engagement to vary among participants. Furthermore, even fewer studies have examined these questions among military personnel or veterans, particularly among those who have served in Iraq and Afghanistan. Existing studies have found a few variables that were associated with PTSD symptom improvement. For example, service members serving in multiple deployments demonstrated greater symptom improvement than those serving in a single deployment. For other demographic variables, the association with improvement is unclear. For example, although we know that female gender may be associated with the development of PTSD, it is not clear how gender is related to PTSD symptom improvement.

If we can better understand why some individuals improve, we can better understand the course and trajectories of PTSD and how to best contribute to individuals' recovery. This study evaluated demographic, military, temporal, and logistic variables that may be associated with PTSD symptom improvement. We were particularly interested in whether seeking mental health treatment sooner was associated with improvement in PTSD symptoms.

METHODS

Data source and extraction

We conducted a retrospective analysis of existing medical records from the VA's Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF)/Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF)/Operation New Dawn (OND) roster, a national database of veterans who have separated from OEF/OIF/OND military service and who have enrolled in VA health care. Veterans of OEF served predominantly in Afghanistan, and veterans of OIF and OND served predominantly in Iraq. We linked the OEF/OIF/OND roster database, which contains veterans' demographic and military service information, to the Decision Support System's National Data Extract of pharmacy data and the VA National Patient Care Database, which provides VA visit dates and associated diagnostic codes from the International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision, Clinical Modification (ICD-9-CM). These data are derived from electronic medical records generated during clinical visits. Visits to mental health outpatient and primary care services are categorized by clinic stop codes. Mental health outpatient services include visits to integrated care clinics providing primary care and mental health care. Fee basis codes designate care that is rendered at non-VA facilities and reimbursed by the VA but do not capture all non-VA care, such as care reimbursed by private insurance. The results of PTSD screening were extracted from the VA Corporate Data Warehouse.

All analyses were restricted to OEF/OIF/OND veterans who had received a diagnosis of PTSD (ICD-9-CM code 309.81) during two or more clinical encounters that occurred after the end of their last deployment and before December 31, 2012; had utilized mental health outpatient care between October 1,

2007 (beginning of nationwide primary care screenings), and December 31, 2012, and had not made any prior use of VA care; and had received PTSD screenings at both the start of treatment (up to three months before and one month after the first mental health visit) and on at least one other occasion occurring at least one year later (N=39,690). Of veterans who newly entered mental health treatment, 83% had a baseline screen for PTSD, and of those with a baseline screen, 50% had a follow-up screen during the period beginning one year later. The follow-up screen that was closest in proximity to the one-year follow-up date was utilized.

Measures

PTSD symptoms were assessed by using the Primary Care PTSD Screen (PC-PTSD), the PTSD Checklist (PCL), or both. Both measures were included in order to capture the most representative sample, given that the PC-PTSD screen is mainly used in VA primary care settings and other non-mental health settings and the PCL is used primarily in VA mental health settings. The PC-PTSD, a brief four-item screen given annually and after each deployment, is designed to detect possible PTSD symptoms. The screen yields binary responses (yes or no) for each of four PTSD symptom clusters: reexperiencing, avoidance, emotional numbing, and hyperarousal; a score of ≥ 3 designates a positive PTSD screen for veterans.

The PCL is a 17-item measure, with each item rating the presence of a different symptom over the past month on a 5-point Likert scale, from not at all to a little bit, moderately, quite a bit, and extremely. The PCL has been shown to have very good internal consistency, and it correlates strongly with other measures of PTSD symptoms. The PCL also demonstrates high diagnostic efficiency (.90). Within the VA, the PCL is mainly administered at the discretion of treating clinicians, typically to track patient progress during the course of mental health treatment. For the purposes of this study, symptoms rated as moderately or above on the PCL were considered present. PTSD symptoms from the PCL were combined in order to create indicators that paralleled each of the four symptom cluster proxies from the PC-PTSD. The validity of the mapping of PCL questions onto PC-PTSD items was tested by examining concordance between the two screens given at the VA on the same date. For the purposes of validation, all OEF/OIF/OND veterans who were administered the PCL and the PC-PTSD on the same date (not restricted to our study sample) were included (N=53,756), with a total of 57,889 instances in which a given veteran had both a PC-PTSD and PCL administered on the same day. [A table describing the mapping of the PCL to the PC-PTSD and agreement between the two instruments is available online as a data supplement to this article.]

We created a composite variable, referred to as the PTSD screen result; endorsing three or more symptoms on either measure constituted a positive screen for PTSD.

Dependent variable

The binary dependent variable, a negative (versus positive) PTSD screen result, was defined as a score of <3 at follow-up on the PTSD screen. This outcome comprised PTSD screen results that had improved or had remained negative compared with baseline results (versus having worsened or remained positive).

Independent variables

The main independent variable was time until initiation of mental health outpatient treatment, which was defined for each person as the time (in years) from the end of the last deployment until the first mental health

outpatient visit. Other independent variables included date of birth, gender, race-ethnicity, marital status, and military characteristics. Details about each person's military characteristics (armed forces branch [Army, Marines, Navy or Coast Guard, or Air Force], rank, component type [National Guard and reserves or active duty], and number of deployments [one or multiple deployments]) were extracted from the OEF/OIF/OND roster. Information about the type of VA facility nearest to the individual and the distance to the closest facility was derived from the OEF/OIF/OND roster by the VA planning and system support group.

The following independent variables were treated as potential confounders because each could account for change in PTSD symptoms: mental health outpatient treatment utilization, defined as the number of mental health clinic visits between the start of mental health treatment and the follow-up screen; regular use of primary care services, defined as a mean interval between visits of six months or fewer; and use of a selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor (SSRI) for 12 consecutive weeks or more, as encoded in VA outpatient pharmacy data.

Analysis

We used logistic regression analysis to examine the association of independent predictor variables with a negative PTSD screen result. In separate logistic regression models, we examined predictors of PTSD screen results for each of the four PTSD symptom clusters (reexperiencing, avoidance, emotional numbing, and hyperarousal). The main predictors of interest included time from the end of the last deployment to initiation of mental health outpatient treatment, gender, age, race-ethnicity, marital status, military component, rank, branch, number of deployments, and distance to and type of nearest VA facility. The multi-variable analysis adjusted for potential confounders of the association between changes in PTSD symptoms and predictors. Potential confounders included baseline PTSD screen result, timing of follow-up screen, regular utilization of primary care services, total mental health outpatient treatment utilization, and SSRI use. Primary care and mental health service utilization and antidepressant use were included only for adjustment purposes because of potential biases due to confounding by indication. More specifically, persons who are more symptomatic are more likely to utilize health services and antidepressant medications.

We tested interactions of demographic and military predictors with each other and, separately, with time to initiation of mental health outpatient treatment. As mentioned above, the study combined results for veterans whose PTSD screen result had improved from baseline with those for veterans whose screen result had remained negative. To determine whether it was valid to combine these scores, we tested interactions of baseline screen results with demographic and military factors and, separately, with time from the end of the last deployment to initiation of mental health outpatient treatment. All tests were two-tailed. Analyses were performed by using SAS, version 9.3. The study was approved by the Committee on Human Research, University of California, San Francisco, and the San Francisco VA Medical Center.

RESULTS

The sample was 90% male, with a mean±SD age of 30.5±8.16; 57% were white, 11% were black, 11% were Hispanic, and 21% were of other or unknown race-ethnicity. At the time of initiation of mental health outpatient treatment, 75% of the veterans screened positive for PTSD, having endorsed

at least three of the four PTSD symptom clusters on the PTSD screen (Table 1). After at least one year (mean follow-up=2.37±.93 years), 27% (N=7,908) of those with a positive screen at baseline had improved, and 43% (N=4,329) of those with a negative screen at baseline continued to screen negative.

Multivariable logistic regression analysis showed that the following characteristics were associated with a negative PTSD screen result: women compared with men, older versus younger age at first mental health outpatient visit, officer rank compared with enlisted rank, service in branches of the military other than the Army, and negative PTSD screen at baseline (Table 2).

Blacks were less likely than whites to have a negative screen result (Table 2), and this difference persisted after adjustment for time from the end of the last deployment to mental health outpatient treatment. Similar to findings of previous studies, the median interval between the end of the last deployment and the use of services was about three months longer for blacks than for whites ($p<.001$; data not shown). The reduced likelihood among blacks versus whites of a negative PTSD screen result was partly driven by the 7% greater probability that blacks would screen positive for PTSD at follow-up after having screened negative at baseline ($p<.001$; results not shown).

Veterans who were married were slightly less likely than those who were never married to have a negative PTSD screen result. Veterans who lived more than ten miles away from the nearest VA facility were less likely than veterans who lived closer to have a negative screen result. Veterans who lived closer to a community-based outpatient clinic than to a VA medical center were also less likely to have a negative screen result.

Notably, veterans who waited longer to initiate mental health outpatient treatment were less likely to have a negative screen result. Figure 1 illustrates the decreasing probability of a negative screen result with each year that passed after the end of the last deployment.

Logistic regression analyses found similar patterns of association between predictor variables and PTSD screen results for each of the four PTSD symptom clusters (results not shown).

DISCUSSION

A number of demographic, military, temporal, and logistic variables were associated with symptom improvement or with continuing to score below the threshold for a positive PTSD screen. Although temporal variables are rarely examined, we found that greater time to mental health outpatient treatment engagement was negatively associated with PTSD symptom improvement. More specifically, veterans who waited longer to get mental health treatment were less likely than veterans who sought treatment sooner to experience PTSD symptom improvement during the study period. This finding sheds light on the importance of continuing to better understand barriers to mental health treatment, particularly given that less than half of veterans with mental health problems seek care and those who seek care do so after significant delays.

Outreach efforts to help veterans engage in treatment in a timely manner are critical and may, in turn, help with PTSD symptom improvement over time. Intervening early when mental health problems are first detected should be a priority. Given that integrated primary and mental health care is now becoming available at many VA health care facilities, this "one-stop shop" model provides an optimal way to decrease time to seeking mental health care. Veterans in primary care who screen positive for any men-

tal health problems can receive immediate mental health assistance within an integrated care model, which may assist with the stigma of receiving care in a mental health setting. Indeed, veterans who received integrated primary care were more likely to receive a mental health evaluation or care within a month.

We also found that female gender was associated with greater PTSD symptom improvement compared with male gender. Although civilian studies found that females are at greater risk of PTSD, findings in military samples have been mixed, with some studies finding no gender differences. In addition, we recently found that although both genders experienced a delay in engaging in minimally adequate mental health care (eight mental health outpatient visits within a year), female veterans received minimally adequate mental health care about two years sooner than male veterans, which may explain why they achieved greater symptom improvement.

Black veterans were less likely, but only modestly so, to demonstrate PTSD symptom improvement, compared with their white counterparts, and this difference was not explained by longer time from the end of the last deployment to mental health outpatient treatment initiation. That is not surprising, given that studies have consistently found that unmet treatment needs are greatest in underserved groups, including racial-ethnic minority groups). It may be that veterans from racial-ethnic minority groups face particular barriers to treatment that are important to acknowledge, and more research is needed in this area in order to optimize outcomes. Furthermore, other variables, such as differential rates of traumatic stressors and preexisting conditions, are important to further explore and may explain some of these differences.

Officers were more likely than enlisted personnel to experience PTSD symptom improvement. One possible explanation is that officer status may be a proxy for higher education; research has shown that lower levels of education are associated with chronic trajectories of PTSD. However, other variables that we were not able to measure, such as social support in the aftermath of trauma, may also explain some of these findings.

A number of limitations should be considered when interpreting these findings. First, this study was conducted with a population of treatment-seeking veterans who had at least one visit to a VA health care facility. Therefore, our results should not be generalized to all OEF/OIF/OND military personnel or veterans. Second, we selected a population of veterans who served in support of OEF/OIF/OND, and, therefore, these results should not be generalized to veterans of other eras or to veterans from other countries. Third, ICD-9-CM diagnoses were acquired from administrative health records and were not verified with standardized diagnostic measures. A related concern is the combined use of two separate validated tools, the PCL and the PC-PTSD. We used both the PCL and the PC-PTSD in order to obtain the most representative sample and because they are the measures used by the VA system. Furthermore, we found that the method we used was statistically reliable. Nonetheless, combining two separate validated tools may have resulted in variations in these data. Future studies should continue to examine the validity and reliability of this method.

Fourth, because of the ways in which data appear in the VA administrative database, we were not able to distinguish between the types of mental health treatments that veterans were receiving, such as evidence-based treatment for PTSD or other mental health

problems versus supportive therapy; rather, we could account only for number of visits. We hope to have better indicators of evidence-based treatment for PTSD in the future so that the particular types of care that veterans receive can be examined more closely in relation to symptom improvement. Fifth, because we used administrative data, we were not able to examine third variables that may be associated with our outcome, including severe avoidance symptoms, interpersonal difficulties, and poor attachment, among others. Finally, we were able to include only veterans whose PTSD symptoms were measured during at least two occasions; those who dropped out after one visit are not as well represented.

CONCLUSIONS

Veterans who waited longer to get mental health treatment were less likely to experience PTSD symptom improvement during the study period. Furthermore, improving barriers for black, male, younger, rural, lower-ranking, and possibly less well educated veterans is an important priority, given our findings. Models that integrate primary care and mental health care may be an optimal way to help expedite veteran treatment engagement.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS AND DISCLOSURES

This research was supported by VA Health Services Research and Development Service (HSR&D) Career Development Award (RCD 06-042) to Dr. Maguen, an HSR&D Service Directed Research Award (SDR-08-408) to Dr. Seal, and a Department of Defense Mental Health Research Infrastructure Award (W81XWH-11-2-0189) to Dr. Neylan. The authors thank Julie Dinh, B.A., for assistance.

Dr. Neylan has received study medication for a study funded by the Department of Defense and study medication for a study funded by the VA. The other authors report no competing interests.

Mr. TAKANO. A smooth care transition from DOD to VA can help support veterans as they adjust to the next phase of their lives and provide easy access to healthcare should any challenges arise.

Everyday Americans find it difficult and frustrating to sign up for healthcare. Now, imagine that you have just come off Active-Duty military service where, for years you were told when and where to show up for your healthcare. You probably heard something about VA services during your transition assistance program but, frankly, you were focused on everything you had to do to finalize your separation from the military and possibly looking for new employment and relocating your family.

Now, after having separated from the military, you are a veteran, and maybe for the first time you have to figure out how to check your eligibility for VA healthcare and navigate the system while potentially also facing some new stress in your personal and family life. This is completely avoidable with EVEST, which simply enrolls you in the VA healthcare for which you are already eligible, ensuring that when you need VA, there aren't any unnecessary roadblocks to seeing a doctor.

Now, let me say that again. This legislation has nothing to do with a veteran's eligibility, nor does it change VA standards or who is eligible. It only connects eligible veterans to VA care faster and easier.

We know that veterans are much more likely to use VA services and care when the process to enroll is simple, and we know that VA care is world class. EVEST is a straightforward tool that will allow us to simplify the transition process and take steps toward preventing veteran suicide.

Automatic enrollment is something policymakers and veterans service organizations and stakeholders have been trying to advance for years, and with EVEST it will finally become a reality.

Paralyzed Veterans of America and Disabled American Veterans have formally endorsed this legislation. The Nurses Organization of Veterans Affairs, the American Federation of Government Employees, the Veterans Healthcare Policy Institute, and the American Psychological Association also support EVEST.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters of support from the Nurses Organization of Veterans Affairs and the Veterans Healthcare Policy Institute.

NURSES ORGANIZATION OF
VETERANS AFFAIRS,
January 14, 2021.

Chairman MARK TAKANO,
Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN TAKANO: On behalf of the nearly 3,000 members of the Nurses Organization of Veterans Affairs (NOVA) we would like to offer our strong support for your bill, H.R. 4673, Ensuring Veterans' Smooth Transition Act (EVEST).

As nurses, caring for Veterans is our number one priority. Your bill will provide Veterans with the option of enrolling in VA healthcare during the critical months following their transition to civilian life and ensure servicemembers separating from active duty receive the critical health care to which they are eligible.

Your bill will also help eliminate barriers to care—including those who may not know they are even eligible to receive care at VA. It will also help to assure the Veteran that they are not alone in seeking care for any physical or mental health condition acquired during their military service.

Offering automatic enrollment with an opt out will help to lessen the burden of navigating the VA healthcare system at a time when they are dealing with many challenges as they transition to civilian life.

NOVA believes that most Veterans will find care provided them within the VA is suited to their individual and complex needs and cannot be matched in the private sector. Many providers at the VA are Veterans themselves so they understand what it means to serve and are trained to provide a Whole Health approach to the Veteran patients' health and well-being.

Thank you for your leadership on this issue and your continued support for Veterans and the healthcare professionals who care for them.

Sincerely,

TARYN-JANAE WILCOX-
OLSON, MHS, RN,
President, Nurses Organization of Veterans Affairs
(NOVA).

VETERANS HEALTHCARE
POLICY INSTITUTE (VHPI),

January 19, 2022.

Endorsement of the "Ensuring Veterans' Smooth Transition Act"

The Veterans Healthcare Policy Institute (VHPI) is pleased to formally endorse House bill H.R. 4673, the "Ensuring Veterans' Smooth Transition Act" or "EVEST Act." The EVEST Act creates a process to automatically enroll Veterans who are eligible, upon their discharge from the military, into the VA for medical care, with an opportunity to opt out. Many Veterans do not receive the health care they have earned through their service because they are unaware of their eligibility or are too overwhelmed during the complex period of transitioning from active duty. By automatically enrolling Veterans into the VA system, many more eligible veterans will be able to utilize valuable VA health care benefits. Many lives will be saved.

This is one of the most important bills in many years, and we are pleased to support its passage.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank Speaker PELOSI and Leader HOYER for considering this legislation today, and I urge the rest of my colleagues to support this vital legislation to increase access to care and ensure a smooth transition to civilian life for veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 4673, the Ensuring Veterans' Smooth Transition, or EVEST Act.

This bill would require VA to automatically enroll every eligible separating servicemember into the VA healthcare system. As a veteran, I know firsthand that the transition from military to civilian life can be hard. One of the goals is to remove barriers to care for veterans, whether they left the military decades ago or just last week.

I believe the intention of the EVEST Act is to further that goal by connecting more at-risk servicemembers with the VA as they leave the service. I support the intention. I know many other Members do as well, which is why I expect the bill to pass the House, and probably on a bipartisan basis.

However, as the ranking member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I have a different perspective on this bill than many of my colleagues. I have taken a long, hard look at this legislation, and what I have seen is a bill that may be well intended but has several potential problems.

To start with, the EVEST Act enrolls separating servicemembers into the VA healthcare system without their knowledge or consent. Only after they have been enrolled does the bill require VA to inform the veterans of their enrollment, the status of their enrollment, and how to opt out by disenrolling themselves.

We shouldn't be signing veterans up for a government program they aren't asking for and may never need without at least letting them know first. And

we shouldn't be telling them that if they don't like it, they can figure out how to disenroll themselves. That is backwards.

Veterans deserve better than that. Veterans also deserve better than a bill that has been rushed through Congress without due diligence. There has never been a single hearing on the EVEST Act in this Congress.

You may hear the chairman say that there has been a hearing on this bill last Congress. That is true. But last Congress and this Congress are very different. We had a different administration last Congress; we had a different VA Secretary last Congress. I believe more than 70 Members are new this Congress. More than half of the membership of the Veterans' Affairs Committee is new as well. And, regardless, VA did not provide testimony at the hearing last Congress.

We have no idea if VA can implement the bill without disrupting service to the veterans already in the VA health system, further burdening VA's already overworked staff, or increasing the strain on VA's already overfull facilities. Every Member of the House hears from veterans in our districts who are waiting too long for care they need, stuck in crowded VA facilities, and being treated by VA staff who are struggling and overwhelmed. I am concerned that this bill could make each of those things worse.

I am not the only one who thinks so. Last week, right before this bill was considered by the Rules Committee, the Biden administration issued a Statement of Administration Policy on the EVEST Act. The statement reads, "There may be challenges implementing this bill as drafted, and the administration looks forward to working with Congress. . . ." In other words, even the President recognizes that this bill needs more work.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the Statement of Administration Policy.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 1836—GUARD AND RESERVE GI BILL PARITY ACT OF 2021—REP. LEVIN, D-CALIFORNIA, AND NINE COSPONSORS

H.R. 4673—ENSURING VETERANS' SMOOTH TRANSITION (EVEST) ACT—REP. TAKANO, D-CALIFORNIA

The Biden-Harris Administration supports efforts that ensure veterans receive timely access to high-quality benefits and services that they have earned.

The Administration supports H.R. 1836, which would expand eligibility criteria for certain education benefits. Current law defines the term "active duty" as those individuals who are on full-time duty in the active military service of the United States, including full-time training duty, annual training duty, and attendance, while in the active military service, at a school designated as a service school by law or by the Secretary of the military department concerned. H.R. 1836 would expand eligibility criteria to include those training in full-time National Guard duty, which includes the National Guard, the Army National Guard, and the Air National Guard, as well as those same members when performing active duty.

The Administration supports the EVEST Act's goal of seamless enrollment in health care coverage. As currently written, H.R. 4673 would require the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) to automatically enroll new veterans into VA health care, and notify veterans of their enrollment and instructions on how to un-enroll, if desired. There may be challenges implementing this bill as drafted, and the Administration looks forward to working with Congress on how best to operationalize its objective.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, to be clear, the Veterans' Affairs Committee had numerous opportunities in the last year to do that work that I had just discussed, and I don't know why the chairman chose not to. I have heard him say over the last week that it is okay we didn't have a hearing on the EVEST Act in this Congress because the bill has been in the public domain.

Now, I am not sure what that statement really means because there have been almost 400 bills introduced in this Congress that have been referred to the Veterans' Affairs Committee. I guess that each of those are in the public domain. But I don't think any of them are ready for a vote here on the House floor.

It is not too much to ask that we seek the input from stakeholders before voting on a bill to become law. That is actually the least we can do. I don't think our constituents sent us here to do anything less than that.

During last week's Rules Committee, Congresswoman TORRES, a member of Chairman TAKANO's own party, seemed to agree with me by lamenting the lack of process this bill has received this Congress. With all due respect to the Congresswoman, I doubt that we agree on much, but we do agree on this, though. Having this bill go through a much more robust process this Congress could have resulted in a much better product for our veterans.

□ 0930

Finally, I want to note that the bill will also cost taxpayers \$3.1 billion in new discretionary spending. Not a penny of that \$3.1 billion is offset.

Implementing this bill will certainly require additional funding above the nearly \$100 billion already appropriated for the VA healthcare system.

We cannot keep saddling our children and grandchildren with billions of dollars more debt. We have to do better than this.

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate that I understand why my colleagues will likely vote for this bill. I wish I could vote for this bill, as well.

Leaving the military was not easy. It can leave new veterans feeling adrift and alone. I have been there. But that is why I supported efforts during the Trump administration to improve the Transition Assistance Program and increase the VA's outreach to separating servicemembers during their first year out of uniform.

I want separating servicemembers who need additional support to be able to get it and the help they need in a

seamless manner. And I am not at all confident that this bill will accomplish that goal without harming services to other veterans and adding to the national debt. As a result, I must oppose this bill today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I reiterate that we should not be hiding the care that our veterans have earned. Let me quickly say that this bill has been in the public domain for 2 years. It was reintroduced last summer, and the minority had over 6 months to talk with us and the VA about it.

Furthermore, the committee has held six hearings on suicide prevention and transition since 2019. The common sense of this bill shines through.

And let me also add that regarding the capacity of VA—and I am glad that the ranking member has entered the statement of administrative support into the Record; that statement clearly says and declares the administration's support and its willingness to work with the administration.

Data shows that VA enrollment has been going down in recent years, and while new enrollment hovers around 400,000 per year, it used to be double that, around one million per year, and using current assumptions, VA projects veteran enrollment in VHA to remain relatively steady from 2019 to 2029.

I am very confident about VA's ability to absorb the additional veterans that will take advantage of VA's world-class healthcare.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MRVAN), my good friend and a member of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Technology Modernization.

Mr. MRVAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. TAKANO for yielding me the time.

It is my honor today to rise in support of H.R. 4673, the Ensuring Veterans' Smooth Transition Act.

I appreciate the leadership of Chairman TAKANO to advance this critical legislation that will require the VA to automatically enroll individuals who are separating from the military into the VA system.

Our brave members of the military put their lives and health on the line every day to keep our Nation safe, defend our democracy, and protect our freedoms.

We have a responsibility to make it as easy as possible for them to transition from military service to civilian life, and I am pleased that this legislation does just that.

My life experiences have afforded me the opportunity as a former township trustee in northwest Indiana to work every day with the veterans community. I was able to initiate a veterans services roundtable and bring together veteran organizations to discuss, coordinate, and streamline much-needed resources to our veterans.

In many instances, it was not that the resources or the benefit was unavailable, but rather, the individual was unaware of the existing benefit, or unable to access, for whatever reason, the very resource they needed.

Today, I am thinking of those countless discussions and individuals as I will vote to support the EVEST Act. It is an effective proposal to help ensure that veterans access the valuable healthcare services available to them during this transition process from active to veteran status.

Today, I want to make sure we meet our veterans' mental health needs and increase veterans' access to healthcare. I again thank Chairman TAKANO and my fellow members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee for your commitment to supporting veterans and bringing this measure to the floor today.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In response to the EVEST Act has been in the public domain, I think it is very important to note, as I mentioned earlier, the last Congress is not the same as this Congress. We have more than 70 Members who are new Members of Congress, half of the Veterans' Affairs Committee is new, we have a different President, and we have a different secretary.

Introducing a bill is not the same as conducting a hearing. You can't get input from the stakeholders. You can't engage in meaningful debate in the public domain. This reflects zero input from the VA, meaning we have no idea whether it is flexible, whether it is workable, whether it is disruptive to the VA system. We don't know.

And even the Biden administration agrees that more work is needed before this bill should become law.

And the previous speaker, Mr. Speaker, spoke about the person that didn't know what was available to them through the VA. If you were my age as a veteran it is true that you could not know because you got a quick class and the TAP program. And I have mentioned on this floor before that that is a tap on the back and see you later.

But today's TAP program is a course that you take, and you are bound to understand separation from your active service and what VA benefits are available to you.

And not only that, the Trump administration in 2018 put an administrative order out that you are then contacted after separation at 90, 180, and 360 days out to be notified of what benefits are available to you in the VA. We are doing that.

This instead enrolls members without their consent, and then they are enrolled. And the only option they have is to be notified later how maybe they can get out of being enrolled.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to add that, in response to the esteemed ranking member, VA formally supports this legislation and has been discussing auto enrollment for years.

VA has already been working to make transition into VA healthcare smoother with Solid Start and will soon have data showing that warm handoffs have a positive impact on veteran outcomes without overwhelming the VA system.

In response to the criticism that VSOs have not had input, I want to point out that VSOs, including Paralyzed Veterans of America and Disabled American Veterans, have already formally endorsed EVEST. Why? Because the common sense of this legislation shines through.

All VSOs have had a chance to weigh in, and many did. The Nurses Organization of Veterans Affairs, the American Federation of Government Employees, the Veterans Health Policy Institute, and the American Psychological Association also support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA), my good friend and a former member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee who now serves on the Agriculture Committee, Homeland Security Committee, and House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of the EVEST Act.

All gave some, and many made the ultimate sacrifice. America has made a promise to our veterans that we will take care of them when they return home.

I represent Orange County, California, and many of my constituents have served their country proudly. One of my constituents, Billy Hall, from the city of Orange, enlisted at the age of 15, served from 1941 to 1945 in World War II, and again from 1948 to 1967 in the Korean and Vietnam wars.

Every servicemember deserves our respect and gratitude, and most of all, all the benefits and care that we promised them when they would return home.

This bill is very simple but very important. It automatically enrolls veterans in the healthcare system. It provides veterans healthcare without the red tape.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the EVEST Act and pass this simple and important commonsense legislation for our veterans.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In my debate and the things that I brought up here today, I never said that VSOs didn't have input. I did say the VA did not come to the committee, and we did not have the proper hearings. If the VA is in support of this bill, I would request that the VA send the

documentation saying how they are in support of this bill. Their input would be vitally important.

Whether it is a Republican or Democrat administration, the VA is vitally important to make sure they provide services to our constituents and to our veterans.

No one on this floor cares more about veterans than the people who serve on this committee—I can guarantee you that—whether it is the chairman or myself.

But we have to make sure what we are providing does what it is we are trying to do. It was mentioned earlier that they believe that this would help reduce suicide among transitioning servicemembers. I care deeply about this. This is something that both I and the chairman have worked on and will continue to work on.

The majority of veterans who die of suicide have not had meaningful engagement with the VA. They may have been enrolled in the VA, but they haven't gotten the VA care that they need.

This bill would add names of eligible separating servicemembers from the VA and put them on the rolls, but it doesn't do the outreach that is necessary to possibly prevent them from that ultimate decision to end their lives.

Those are the type of things we are working on and will continue to work on. This is not the answer to that. There are a lot of other concerns that I have expressed and will continue to express.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me say that the amendments that we are considering to this bill today, which I consider friendly, will address many of the ranking member's concerns about the reaching out.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES), my good friend who serves on the Financial Services Committee and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman TAKANO for moving this very important legislation.

In this polarized and angry time, one of the lights of this institution is that we have always come together to better serve our veterans, to better serve those men and women who took the ultimate risk and were prepared to make the ultimate sacrifice on behalf of all of us and the system that this room embodies.

And this is a real problem. As I go around my district and I talk to young veterans, they face any number of transitional issues; with housing, with healthcare. And let's face it, the change from being on active duty to being a veteran is a challenging one, one that all too often results in the kind of tragedy that we have acknowledged here in this Chamber today.

And so I rise in strong support of the EVEST Act. It is consistent with something that I am very proud to have accomplished many years ago when we passed the SERVE Act, which made it easier for veterans to show that they had an income so that they could get the housing which they were entitled to. It was a small thing, but it just eased the passage for those young men and women who have so well served this country.

This is important, and it is not a big deal, but it is going to affect tens of thousands of veterans. My Republican friends know that I respect and value their input and their objections to our ideas. It makes us better when you pose objections to our ideas. But I am a little puzzled by the objections that I am hearing today.

I have heard sitting here that this is not paid for. Okay. It is \$3 billion that I think is well spent on perhaps the most valuable population that we have. But the notion that it is not paid for, let's remember it was just a couple years ago that my friends on the Republican side passed \$2 trillion in tax cuts, 83 percent of which benefitted the top 1 percent of this country's citizens. I have to believe that if we can do \$2 trillion in tax cuts that largely benefits the richest Americans, that we can find \$3 billion to ease the passage for our veterans.

□ 0945

I have heard the ranking member say that the VA maybe can't handle it. Let's remember that the VA supports this idea and that we are just asking them to do a little bit more of what they already do. This is not some new and fanciful program. No, it is making a program that is well-established available to more.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. I am particularly proud of my friend and neighbor—JOE COURTNEY will talk about this shortly—that my neighbor, JAHANA HAYES, is proposing an amendment that will increase the notification that goes to veterans about what is available to them.

This bill needs to pass because, at the end of the day, we are answering the question: Do we want more veterans to have access to what we have promised them, or do we want fewer veterans to have access to what we have promised them? That is what is at stake here.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member and urge him to rethink his objections to this bill because this will be a proud moment when this bill passes.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs did not do our job on this bill. We did not consider this bill in a legislative hearing. We did not seek input from stakeholders or the VA. We did not make certain that automatically enrolling newly separated servicemembers into the VA healthcare system would not

impede access for existing employees or cause funding crises. And those things are very, very real.

Even the Biden OMB has admitted that there are going to be challenges with implementing this bill. If you look at the numbers—and I am going to add this into what should be mentioned—19.1 million veterans is what we have; 9 million veterans are enrolled; 7 million have used access to the VA. If we start and do it this way without letting veterans make decisions on their own, it can overwhelm the VA. That is what has been mentioned by OMB.

Veterans are already facing tough challenges. So is the VA health system that they can go to. But we don't need to add any more to their plates without at least hearing how it is going to affect the services that are already being provided to our veterans.

That is why, just so you know, I am offering a motion to recommit this morning. My motion to recommit, if adopted, would send this bill back to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to consider an amendment to H.R. 4673 that would delay implementation until 30 days after the VA has certified that it can implement, without disruption, services to veterans or requiring additional funds.

Mr. Speaker, I don't see how those who support this bill, despite its problems and the Biden administration's recognition that it may cause challenges, can object to this amendment. The very least we can do for the millions of veterans who are already enrolled in VA care and counting on VA services is to ensure—before this bill goes into effect—that it won't cause undue harm to them. I have already drafted an amendment that would accomplish that goal.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support my motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say, in response to my friend, the esteemed ranking member, that his MTR, which would delay implementation in order to avoid harm to our veterans, dare I say that the harm is in the delay.

I am reminded of a quote from the VFW's Pat Murray that we had at yesterday's roundtable on toxic exposure: Our pay-for for this bill and our pay-for, frankly, for all that we do for veterans was the ticket that we sent servicemembers overseas to serve. I repeat: Our pay-for was the ticket we sent servicemembers overseas to serve.

And a little further discussion on the pay-for issue: The Congressional Budget

et Office does not estimate that this bill will increase mandatory spending and does not require an offset. These are the rules we play by.

Again, we are not creating new eligibility here. The only cost of this bill is veterans seeking care that they are already eligible for. We are all better off when veterans are seeking the care that they need, and we should not be hiding that care for which they are eligible.

Automatic enrollment in VA healthcare for eligible veterans is a long-needed suicide prevention tool. We cannot put a price tag on protecting the health and safety of our veterans. Many of these veterans would go on to use VA healthcare even if they are not automatically enrolled, and the minority does not give a compelling reason why we should hinder or make that process more difficult for our veterans.

Again, I repeat, we should not be hiding the care for which our veterans are already eligible.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that all my colleagues join me in passing H.R. 4673, as amended, and I anticipate we will see a big bipartisan vote today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I stand here in strong support of H.R. 1836, the Ensuring Veterans' Smooth Transition Act (EVEST), which provides automatic enrollment in the VA for all transitioning service members, and veterans who don't want to obtain its services have the easy choice of opting out.

Specifically, this bill would:

Automatically enroll new veterans into VA Health Care;

Provide VA with information about transitioning service members;

Require the VA to reach out to veterans about the scope of, and access to, benefits.

Assuring future cohorts of veterans—including those struggling with the Taliban triumph in Afghanistan—don't go without health care during their transition from military to civilian life is the worthy goal of this bill.

After attempting suicide while serving on active duty in Iraq, Kristofer Goldsmith was given a general discharge by the Army and little else.

The overwhelmed 21-year-old returned to his hometown on Long Island, N.Y., totally unaware that he was eligible for care from the Veterans Health Administration (VA).

"I had just lost my income, my support network, my identity, and almost my life. I was in a total mental health crisis," Goldsmith said.

During the critical months following his transition to civilian life, he went without desperately needed services.

If his mother hadn't forced him to go to the VA, Goldsmith, who credits the VA with helping him rebuild his life, doesn't know what would have happened to him.

Of this, however, he is certain, "If I had heard from my local VA informing me of what benefits I had and that I'd been enrolled in the system, it would have changed my life drastically."

This bill would help thousands of veterans who need services for the multitude of conditions acquired or exacerbated by military service but are confused about how to access them.

These ailments include everything from respiratory problems caused by burn-pit toxic exposure to signature combat conditions such as Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) and Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).

For all these problems, prompt attention means everything.

For example, according to research conducted by the VA, veterans who received care soon after the end of their service “had lower levels of PTSD upon follow-up a year after they initiated care.

According to the study, for each year that a veteran waited to initiate treatment, there was about a 5 percent increase in the odds of their PTSD either not improving or worsening.

In 2018, the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine found that post-9/11 veterans who had not sought VA mental health care didn’t know how to apply for benefits—or were unsure whether they were even eligible.

Some didn’t know what services the VA offered or felt that they didn’t deserve care even if they could get it.

Some women veterans are similarly unsure whether VA services are even available to their gender.

This legislation will not only be key to eliminating these barriers but also to reducing the veteran suicide crisis.

A disproportionate number of veterans die by suicide during the initial months and years following separation from military service.

Veterans ages 18 to 34 have the highest rate of suicide.

Automatic pre-enrollment could be lifesaving during a crisis when speed is of the essence.

Smother access to VA health care has never been more important than it is today.

The tumultuous end of the war in Afghanistan is intensifying mental health symptoms within the veteran population.

I am proud to support this legislation in order to better serve veterans and reduce veteran suicide.

This bill, in which we further the benefits and recognition that our servicemen and women deserve, also reminds us that we have an overriding duty to protect the health and dignity of those serving today.

For this reason, I would like to discuss the crisis that our National Guardsmen and Guardswomen have been thrust into at the Texas Governor’s direction on our Southern Border.

In March 2021, the Texas Governor launched the ill-fated and ineffective Operation Lone Star which he claimed was necessary to stem a so-called invasion of migrants at Texas’ southern border.

As of November 2021, more than 10,000 Texas National Guardsmen have been deployed to the southern border in pursuit of this folly.

According to published media accounts, National Guard members who have been activated for Operation Lone Star are experiencing habitual pay delays and poor working conditions during the border mission, including being exposed to COVID-19, and many are missing the equipment necessary for safety and mission success.

In addition, the National Guard has faced austere conditions and limited resources, leading to unsanitary conditions such as the lack of portable restrooms.

Rather than addressing these conditions, just last week the Texas Governor filed a frivo-

lous lawsuit in federal court challenging the authority of President Biden, the Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces to require that members of the National Guard be vaccinated against COVID-19.

There is no merit to this nuisance law suit as demonstrated by the summary rejection of similar arguments raised by neighboring Oklahoma Governor Stitt.

The Texas Governor’s failure to comply with the policies intended to reduce the spread of COVID-19 among the Armed Forces will mean that there will be less military personnel available national disasters that have struck Texas in recent years, such as the winter freeze of last year.

This will also mean that there are fewer personnel to respond to any attacks on the homeland.

Encouraged by the Texas Governor’s obstinacy, about 40% of the members of the Texas Army National Guard are refusing to get vaccinated, which puts at risk their colleagues and the persons they are sworn to defend and protect.

National Guardsmen and Guardswomen deployed in this disastrous mission at the Texas Governor’s insistence face the deadly spread of COVID-19, unsanitary conditions, lack of pay, and a lack of a certain future.

These uniformed men and women deserve better, and some of them, seeing no alternative to their present reality, have decided to end it all.

Five National guard soldiers have shot and killed themselves in the past three months, and one more survived a suicide attempt.

One of these men, private first class Joshua R. Cortez, was preparing to accept a “lifetime job” with one of the nation’s biggest health insurance companies in late October last year, but the Texas National Guard had other ideas.

Operation Lone Star required involuntary activations to meet the Texas Governor’s troop quotas, and Cortez was one of the soldiers tapped to go on state active duty orders—with no idea how long the mission would last.

In November, the 21-year-old mechanic requested a hardship release from the mission: “I’ve been waiting for this job and I’m on my way to getting hired . . . I missed my first opportunity in September when I had to go on the flood mission in Louisiana. . . . I can not miss this opportunity because it is my last opportunity for this lifetime job.”

Cortez’s company commander recommended approval. But his battalion commander and brigade commander disapproved.

Within 36 hours of his request being denied, Cortez drove to a parking lot in northwest San Antonio and shot himself in the head.

Three other soldiers tied to Operation Lone Star have died by suicide, including:

Sgt. Jose L. De Hoyos was found dead in Laredo, Texas, on Oct. 26. He was a member of the 949th Brigade Support Battalion’s headquarters company.

1st Sgt. John “Kenny” Crutcher died Nov. 12, as time ran out on his temporary hardship waiver. He was the top NCO for B Company, 3rd Battalion, 144th Infantry.

1st Lt. Charles Williams, a platoon leader in Crutcher’s company, died at home overnight Dec. 17 while on pass.

The string of suicides raises urgent questions about the mission’s conditions and purpose, as well as the way it’s organized and manned through indefinite involuntary call-ups.

This is an excellent and common-sense bill that will enhance the benefits of our servicemen and women.

We must also act to ensure that our servicemen and women are protected from COVID-19, both for their own safety and the safety of our nation.

Although we cannot bring back the lives lost due to the Texas Governor’s misguided actions, we can remember the names of those we have lost and work to ensure that we treat all members of our military equally and with dignity and respect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Each further amendment printed in part B of House Resolution 117-225, not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 5 of House Resolution 860, shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part B of House Report 117-225 not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR. TAKANO OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 5 of House Resolution 860, I rise to offer the four amendments en bloc to H.R. 4673.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc consisting of amendment Nos. 1, 2, 4, and 5, printed in part B of House Report 117-225, offered by Mr. TAKANO of California:

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. DELGADO OF NEW YORK

Page 1, line 15, insert “(A)” before “Not later”.

Page 1, line 18, strike “(A)” and insert “(i)”.

Page 2, line 1, strike “(B)” and insert “(ii)”.

Page 2, after line 3, insert the following: “(B) In carrying out subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall consider using, to the extent practical, mass texting capabilities through mobile telephones.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. DELGADO OF NEW YORK

At the end of the bill, add the following:
SEC. 3. GAO REPORT ON NOTICE OF AUTOMATIC ENROLLMENT IN PATIENT ENROLLMENT SYSTEM OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller

General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report containing the results of a study to determine the best methods for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide notice under paragraph (2) of subsection (d) of section 1705 of title 38, United States Code, as added by section 2. In making such determination, the Comptroller General shall consider needs of veterans based on—

- (1) age;
- (2) residence in urban areas; and
- (3) residence in rural areas.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MRS. HAYES OF CONNECTICUT

Page 1, line 15, insert “(A)” before “Not later”.

Page 1, line 18, strike “(A)” and insert “(i)”.

Page 1, line 18, strike “and”.

Page 2, line 1, strike “(B)” and insert “(ii)”.

Page 2, line 3, strike the period and insert “; and”.

Page 2, after line 3, insert the following:

“(iii) instructions for how the veteran may elect to enroll at a later date.

“(B) Any notice or instructions required to be provided under this paragraph shall be provided in the form of a physical copy delivered by mail and, to the extent practical, in the form of an electronic copy delivered by electronic mail.”.

Page 3, after line 5, insert the following:

(d) PROVISION OF NOTICE AND INFORMATION.—The notice and instructions required to be provided under subsection (d)(2) of section 1705 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall be provided in accordance with the established procedures of the Department of Veterans Affairs with respect to the provision of similar types of notices and instructions.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. TLAIB OF MICHIGAN

Add at the end the following:

(d) REPORT ON AUTOMATIC ENROLLMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the first veteran is enrolled in the patient enrollment system of the Department of Veterans Affairs under subsection (d) of section 1705 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the enrollment process under such subsection. Such report shall include each of the following:

(A) A discussion of any anticipated challenges that occurred in implementing such subsection, the strategies used to address such challenges, and the effectiveness of such strategies.

(B) A discussion of any unanticipated challenges that occurred in implementing such subsection, the strategies used to address such challenges, and the effectiveness of such strategies.

(C) Any additional information the Secretary determines appropriate, including information that may be useful to other Federal departments and agencies considering the implementation of similar automatic enrollment programs.

(2) FORM OF REPORT.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 860, the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of these en bloc

amendments. Seamlessly connecting veterans with the benefits and care they earned through their service is paramount to the transition process.

The Delgado amendment No. 1 makes sure that VA can easily notify veterans regarding care and services through mass texting. As technology and communication methods improve, so should how VA uses those capabilities to easily inform veterans of their benefits. Texting eligible veterans to tell them they have been auto-enrolled in VA healthcare is an effective, simple way to increase awareness of the care available to them.

The Delgado amendment No. 2 requires GAO to submit a report to determine the best methods to notify veterans regarding their automatic enrollment in VA healthcare. This amendment will strengthen the underlying bill and inform best practices for how VA can ensure veterans have the information they need regarding their access to care and services.

Getting information to veterans in an effective manner is crucial to their transition into civilian life, and the Delgado amendment No. 2 will help improve how VA communicates an eligible veteran's enrollment in VA healthcare so they can easily access the care they need.

The Hayes amendment requires that VA notify veterans who opt out of automatic enrollment that they may elect to enroll at a later date. We understand there will be some veterans who opt out for auto-enrollment for a variety of reasons, but it is our duty that they know that the VA will be waiting for them if their future needs change.

Ensuring VA adopts and scales best practices related to auto-enrollment while also learning from any issues that arise during its rollout is important to the long-term effectiveness of the aims of H.R. 4673.

The Tlaib amendment requires the VA to submit a report a year after the first veteran is auto-enrolled in VA healthcare to preserve lessons learned from the rollout. This report will help improve auto-enrollment for both the VA administrators implementing the program and veteran users alike.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the en bloc amendments, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the four en bloc amendments are offered by Congressman DELGADO, Congresswoman HAYES, and Congresswoman TLAIB. I thank them for their work. I remain opposed to the underlying bill, and I explained why in detail over the last debate.

One of the reasons I was opposed to it is because the Committee on Veterans' Affairs did not do our job before bringing this bill to the floor. We did not hold hearings on the bill or seek input from stakeholders. And importantly, we did not get assurance from the VA that the bill could be implemented without negative impact to services.

In fact, shortly before this bill hit the Rules Committee, the Biden administration did release the statement that we talked about earlier. That statement, remember, says that there are challenges in implementing this bill.

Now, I wish we could have done that work in the VA Committee before considering the bill on the floor. If there are challenges, we need to know about them, and we need to be able to address them to make sure that no veteran is harmed by this bill.

Nevertheless, here we are. These en bloc amendments will help get some of the information we should have gotten before passing the bill. They will help us stay informed on how the bill is working and the impact it is having on veterans and on the VA healthcare system after the fact.

For example, one of Congressman DELGADO's amendments would require GAO to study the best methods for VA to notify newly separated servicemembers of their enrollment status. His second amendment would require VA to consider texting newly separated servicemembers to inform them of their enrollment status and their ability to disenroll. If a veteran chooses to disenroll, Congresswoman HAYES' amendment would require VA to provide them with information on how to enroll at a later date if they change their mind down the line.

Finally, Congresswoman TLAIB's amendment would require VA to report to Congress on the implementation of this bill not later than 1 year after enactment. That would allow us to course-correct, as needed, if the bill is causing problems at least 1 year out.

Now, I feel like a broken record, but this is information we should have had already. Nevertheless, it is better late than never. That is why I will be in support of that amendment alongside the amendments for DELGADO and HAYES.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to do the same, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY), my good friend who serves on the House Committee on Armed Services as chairman of the Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces and the Committee on Education and Labor.

□ 1000

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. TAKANO and Ranking Member BOST for supporting the en bloc.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor today to speak on behalf of the Hayes amendment offered by my friend and neighbor from Connecticut, Congresswoman JAHANA HAYES, who unfortunately could not be here today because she is

quarantining. Her amendment is a commonsense proposal to improve an already outstanding bill that will connect more veterans to benefits they have earned by volunteering to wear the uniform of this country.

Mr. Speaker, last year, at the outset of the VA's highly successful COVID vaccination program, Congresswoman HAYES and I both toured the VA hospital in West Haven, Connecticut, which is the flagship of our VA healthcare system. I had a chance to personally observe her authentic, well-informed advocacy for veteran patients and their family members, asking questions about ways Congress can improve the system, particularly about communicating the full extent of their benefits.

She described casework from the veterans seeking care, about the burdens they faced when navigating a complicated system where not only veterans, but family members struggle to stay current with changing rules and programs. It is particularly troublesome to hear cases of veterans who lose eligibility for help because of late claims caused by poor communication, oftentimes at the time of discharge from military service.

Mr. Speaker, that is why it is so important for the House to pass the EVEST Act which will provide automatic enrollment in the VA system for all transitioning servicemembers.

Mrs. HAYES' friendly amendment wisely requires the VA to go the extra mile and inform veterans who opt out of automatic enrollment through multiple methods, including not only email but also paper mail, that they can reenroll as they transition out of the military. Her measure is a commonsense insurance that veterans are informed of the EVEST so that they know from day one all of the options and rights that they have to get help.

Mr. Speaker, I want to again thank Chair TAKANO and Ranking Member BOST.

And I will close by simply noting that my district in eastern Connecticut is home to the largest military installation in New England, with 9,000 sailors and officers who work every day to protect our Nation. The transition from military to civilian life happens on a rolling, nonstop basis. Too often we work with veterans who experience gaps in benefits caused by a failure to enroll or late enrollment, which this excellent bill will fix.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Hayes amendment in the en bloc and the underlying bill.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB), my good friend and author of this amendment. She serves on the Financial Services Com-

mittee, the Natural Resources Committee and the Oversight and Reform Committee.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman TAKANO and the committee staff for working with me on this important amendment and for their leadership on this bill. I can't thank him enough and look forward to him one day coming to my district for a visit to our VA hospital that we love and cherish.

Mr. Speaker, the transition of being on Active Duty to being a veteran is not easy. The EVEST Act helps with that transition and makes life easier for those who served our Nation.

This act is also a great opportunity to review the automatic enrollment programs and learn what works and what doesn't, because ensuring effective implementation is critical to its success.

Mr. Speaker, I am a social worker at heart, and we have to ensure that our veterans' lives are changing for the better with this bill. My amendment ensures the lessons learned during implementation of the program are preserved for other agencies, as well as to learn, again, what to do and what not to do.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the committee for working with me on this and look forward to my colleagues' support of this amendment. I also look forward to working with the committee on a number of other issues impacting our veterans, especially veteran suicide and access to mental health services.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN), my good friend and member of the Financial Services Committee where he is chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, by way of further introduction, I am the same AL GREEN who lives across the street from the DeBakey VA hospital; the same AL GREEN who fought in this Congress to secure a Congressional Gold Medal for Dr. Michael E. DeBakey; the same AL GREEN who has 800 flags outside of his office presently to be distributed over at the DeBakey VA hospital; the same AL GREEN that goes there annually and speaks to veterans, who talks to them about their needs on an annual basis; the same AL GREEN who has had veterans who tell me the difficulties associated with enrollment; the same AL GREEN who has veterans who say they are so pleased that somebody would come by to be of service to them.

Mr. Speaker, this AL GREEN announces here and now that I will support the underlying bill. I support it because it is necessary. I support it because I believe the veterans that I have spoken to will support it. They need it, and they will enjoy knowing that we came to this floor to bring this to fruition.

Mr. Speaker, finally, if the VA hospital is not properly funded and this

creates some funding issues, I am prepared to vote to fund the VA hospital sufficiently so that our veterans can be taken care of. Anyone who is willing to go to a distant place, who may not return the same way they left, who may have issues for the rest of their lives, and they do it because they want to protect this country, I am going to do all that I can to protect them. This is the least a grateful Nation can do.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I am prepared to close. I ask all my colleagues to support me in supporting these four amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 860, the previous question is ordered on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

The question is on the amendments en bloc.

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. ESCOBAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 117-225.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 12, insert after "a veteran" the following: "who is discharged or separated from the Armed Forces on or after the date that is 90 days before the date of the enactment of this Act and".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 860, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman TAKANO for his continued, strong, unwavering leadership on behalf of our veterans.

I am proud to represent a district that is home to a strong and growing veteran community, and proud to represent Fort Bliss in Congress, where thousands of our servicemembers transition to civilian life.

One of my top priorities in Congress has been to protect our veterans and their families in the same way they have served and defended our country. Today, I am honored to stand in support of this critical legislation for our Nation's veterans and to present my amendment.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4673, the Ensuring Veterans' Smooth Transition Act, provides automatic enrollment in the VA for all transitioning servicemembers. This bill is vital in that it expedites

the use of healthcare benefits that veterans have already earned. My amendment seeks to ensure that servicemembers who were discharged up to 90 days before the enactment of this legislation can also reap its benefits.

Servicemembers transitioning to civilian life already face a multitude of hurdles, from adjusting to everyday life, dealing with unemployment issues, housing and security, and poor mental and physical health, among other things.

Mr. Speaker, our veterans deserve that we eliminate these and any other barriers. Thousands of veterans leave the service without knowing about the VA, whether they are eligible, and what benefits they are entitled to receive.

Veterans who returned to civilian life during the pandemic faced even more challenges to access and overall engagement with the VA due to closures and the VA's limited operational capacity at the height of the pandemic. We cannot leave these veterans behind.

Already, more than half of eligible veterans don't use VA health benefits, many of which are due to confusion on eligibility and benefits and lack of access to information. The pandemic only exacerbated this. Our withdrawal from Afghanistan this past year similarly impacted millions of veterans who now need that care more than ever.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment is not adding any new entitlements. It is simply extending them to those who are equally in need. With my amendment to this bill, we can ensure that newly transitioned veterans do not miss the opportunity to access VA benefits they deserve and are entitled to.

As our chairman has said, when it comes to supporting our veterans, the true heroes of our country, there is always more work to be done. This bill is truly transformative and assures future cohorts of veterans receive the expeditious access to the healthcare they need.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on my amendment. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized. There was no objection.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Congresswoman ESCOBAR's amendment would expand automatic enrollment to servicemembers who left the military 90 days before this bill is enacted. There are already many existing mechanisms for separating servicemembers to connect with the VA if that is something they need and want.

As I explained during the general debate, I have a number of serious concerns with the underlying bill. The Biden administration agrees that there are challenges. I think that is an understatement. Regardless, we should not be further complicating an already

difficult implementation by expanding it even more.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Escobar amendment to H.R. 4673.

Mr. Speaker, seamlessly connecting veterans with the benefits and care they have earned through their service is paramount to the transition process. The Escobar amendment extends the automatic enrollment in VA healthcare to eligible veterans discharged within 90 days before enactment of the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, many of the 175,000 veterans who served in Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation Iraqi Freedom, and Operation New Dawn are unaware of their eligibility for 5 years of VA healthcare upon separation. Automatically enrolling recently separated eligible veterans into VA healthcare will support our aim to prevent veteran suicides and improve their access to care during their transition to civilian life.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Escobar amendment.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 860, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appear to have it.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 198, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

YEAS—228

Adams	Carter (LA)	DeFazio
Aguilar	Cartwright	DeGette
Allred	Case	DeLauro
Auchincloss	Casten	DelBene
Axne	Castor (FL)	Delgado
Barragán	Castro (TX)	Demings
Bass	Cherfilus-	DeSaulnier
Beatty	McCormick	Deutch
Bera	Chu	Dingell
Beyer	Cielline	Doggett
Bishop (GA)	Clark (MA)	Doyle, Michael
Blumenauer	Clarke (NY)	F.
Blunt Rochester	Cleaver	Escobar
Bonamici	Clyburn	Eshoo
Bourdeaux	Cohen	Espallat
Bowman	Connolly	Evans
Boyle, Brendan	Cooper	Fitzpatrick
F.	Correa	Fletcher
Brown (MD)	Costa	Foster
Brown (OH)	Courtney	Frankel, Lois
Brownley	Craig	Gallego
Bush	Crist	Garamendi
Bustos	Crow	Garcia (IL)
Butterfield	Cuellar	Garcia (TX)
Carbajal	Davids (KS)	Golden
Cárdenas	Davis, Danny K.	Gomez
Carson	Dean	

Gonzalez, Vicente	Manning	Schiff
Gotthelmer	Mast	Schneider
Green, Al (TX)	Matsui	Schrader
Grijalva	McBath	Schrier
Grijalva	McCollum	Scott (VA)
Harder (CA)	McEachin	Scott, David
Hayes	McGovern	Sewell
Higgins (NY)	McNerney	Sherman
Himes	Meeks	Sherrill
Horsford	Meijer	Sires
Houlahan	Meng	Slotkin
Hoyer	Mfume	Smith (NJ)
Huffman	Moore (WI)	Smith (WA)
Jackson Lee	Morelle	Soto
Jacobs (CA)	Moulton	Spanberger
Jayapal	Mrvan	Speier
Jeffries	Murphy (FL)	Stansbury
Johnson (TX)	Nadler	Stanton
Jones	Napolitano	Stevens
Kahele	Neal	Strickland
Kaptur	Neguse	Suozi
Katko	Newman	Swalwell
Keating	Norcross	Takano
Kelly (IL)	O'Halleran	Thompson (CA)
Khanna	Ocasio-Cortez	Thompson (MS)
Kildee	Omar	Thompson (PA)
Kilmer	Pallone	Titus
Kim (NJ)	Panetta	Tlaib
Kind	Pappas	Tonko
Kirkpatrick	Pascarell	Torres (CA)
Krishnamoorthi	Payne	Torres (NY)
Kuster	Perlmutter	Trahan
Lamb	Peters	Trone
Langevin	Phillips	Underwood
Larsen (WA)	Pingree	Valadao
Larson (CT)	Pocan	Vargas
Lawrence	Porter	Veasey
Lawson (FL)	Pressley	Vela
Lee (CA)	Price (NC)	Velázquez
Lee (NV)	Quigley	Wasserman
Leger Fernandez	Raskin	Schultz
Levin (CA)	Rice (NY)	Waters
Levin (MI)	Ross	Watson Coleman
Lieu	Roybal-Allard	Welch
Lofgren	Ruiz	Wexton
Lowenthal	Ruppersberger	Wild
Luria	Rush	Williams (GA)
Lynch	Ryan	Wilson (FL)
Malinowski	Sánchez	Wittman
Maloney,	Sarbanes	Yarmuth
Carolyn B.	Scanlon	
Maloney, Sean	Schakowsky	

NAYS—198

Aderholt	DesJarlais	Herrera Beutler
Allen	Diaz-Balart	Hice (GA)
Amodei	Donalds	Higgins (LA)
Armstrong	Dunn	Hill
Arrington	Ellzey	Hinson
Babin	Emmer	Hudson
Bacon	Estes	Huizenga
Baird	Fallon	Issa
Balderson	Feenstra	Jackson
Banks	Ferguson	Jacobs (NY)
Barr	Fischbach	Johnson (LA)
Bentz	Fitzgerald	Johnson (OH)
Bergman	Fleischmann	Johnson (SD)
Bice (OK)	Fortenberry	Jordan
Bilirakis	Fox	Joyce (OH)
Bishop (NC)	Franklin, C.	Joyce (PA)
Boebert	Scott	Keller
Bost	Fulcher	Kelly (MS)
Brady	Gaetz	Kelly (PA)
Brooks	Gallagher	Kim (CA)
Buchanan	Garbarino	Kinzinger
Buck	Garcia (CA)	Kustoff
Bucshon	Gibbs	LaHood
Budd	Gimenez	LaMalfa
Burchett	Gohmert	Lamborn
Burgess	Gonzales, Tony	Latta
Calvert	Gonzalez (OH)	LaTurner
Cammack	Good (VA)	Lesko
Carey	Gooden (TX)	Letlow
Carl	Gosar	Long
Carter (GA)	Granger	Loudermilk
Carter (TX)	Graves (LA)	Lucas
Cawthorn	Graves (MO)	Luetkemeyer
Chabot	Green (TN)	Mace
Cheney	Greene (GA)	Malliotakis
Cline	Griffith	Mann
Cloud	Grothman	McCarthy
Clyde	Guest	McCaul
Cole	Guthrie	McClain
Comer	Hagedorn	McKinley
Crawford	Harris	Meuser
Crenshaw	Harshbarger	Miller (IL)
Curtis	Hartzler	Miller (WV)
Davidson	Hern	Miller-Meeks
Davis, Rodney	Herrell	Moolenaar

Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Oberholte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)

Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor

Tenney
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Van Drew
Van Duyn
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—7

Biggs
Duncan
Hollingsworth

Johnson (GA)
Massie
McClintock

McHenry

□ 1050

Messrs. COMER, BURGESS, JOYCE of Pennsylvania, and GONZALEZ of Ohio changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. WITTMAN, VALADAO, and MEEKS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Adams (Brown)
(MD)
Bass (Cicilline)
Beatty (Kuster)
Blumenauer
(Beyer)
Boyle, Brendan
F. (Gallego)
Brown (OH)
(Kaptur)
Brownley
(Kuster)
Bush (Bowman)
Butterfield
(Panetta)
Carter (LA)
(Jeffries)
Cawthorn (Nehls)
Chu (Clark MA))
Cleaver (Davids
(KS)
Clyburn
(Panetta)
Cohen (Beyer)
Costa (Correa)
Crawford
(Stewart)
Crist (Soto)
Cuellar (Correa)
Davis, Danny K.
(Garcia (IL))
DeFazio (Brown
(MD))
DeGette (Blunt
Rochester)
Demings (Soto)
DeSaulnier
(Beyer)
Doggett (Raskin)
Doyle, Michael
F. (Connolly)
Evans (Mfume)
Fallon (Gooden)
Fletcher (Allred)
Fortenberry
(Moolenaar)
Frankel, Lois
(Clark MA))
Garamendi
(Sherman)
Gohmert (Weber
(TX))

Gonzalez,
Vicente
(Correa)
Gottheimer
(Panetta)
Granger
(Calvert)
Grijalva (Garcia
(IL))
Hagedorn (Carl)
Hayes (Clark
(MA))
Higgins (NY)
(Bowman)
Jayapal (Raskin)
Keating (Clark
(MA))
Kelly (IL)
(Kuster)
Kildee (Panetta)
Kilmer (Bera)
Kinzinger
(Meijer)
Kirkpatrick
(Pallone)
Krishnamoorthi
(Bera)
Lawrence
(Stevens)
Lawson (FL)
(Soto)
Lee (CA)
(Khanna)
Lofgren (Jeffries)
Loudermilk
(Fleischmann)
Lowenthal
(Beyer)
Lynch (Trahan)
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
(Wasserman)
Schultz
McBath (Allred)
McCollum (Blunt
Rochester)
McEachin
(Weston)
Meng (Kuster)
Moore (UT)
(Meijer)

Moore (WI)
(Beyer)
Moulton (Clark
(MA))
Nadler (Pallone)
Napolitano
(Correa)
Neguse
(Perlmutter)
Newman (Clark
(MA))
Norman (Wilson
(SC))
Ocasio-Cortez
(Garcia (IL))
Pascrell
(Pallone)
Payne (Pallone)
Pingree
(Cicilline)
Pocan (Raskin)
Porter (Wexton)
Reed (Kelly
(PA))
Rogers (KY)
(Reschenthaler)
Roybal-Allard
(Levin (CA))
Ruiz
(Correa)
Ruppersberger
(Raskin)
Rush (Kaptur)
Schneider
(Connolly)
Schrier
(Spanberger)
Scott, David
(Jeffries)
Sires (Pallone)
Swalwell
(Gomez)
Timmons
(Armstrong)
Titus (Connolly)
Trone (Brown
(MD))
Van Drew
(Reschenthaler)
Vargas (Correa)
Vela (Correa)
Velázquez (Clark

(MA))Waters
(Takano)

Watson Coleman
(Pallone)
Welch (Raskin)

Wilson (FL)
(Cicilline)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. Bost of Illinois moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4673 to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The material previously referred to by Mr. BOST is as follows:

In section 2(b), strike “the date of the enactment of this Act” and insert “the effective date of this Act”.

In section 2(c), strike “Not later than August 1, 2022” and insert “Subject to subsection (d), not later than August 1, 2022”

At the end, add the following:

(d) DELAYED EFFECTIVE DATE; READINESS CERTIFICATION.—This Act, including the amendments made by this Act, shall not take effect until 30 days after the date on which the Secretary of Veterans Affairs submits to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Senate a certification that the requirements of this Act may be carried out without requiring additional resources or disrupting services for veterans currently enrolled in the patient enrollment system under section 1705 of title 38, United States Code.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 206, nays 221, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 13]

YEAS—206

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks

Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford

Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Elizy
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry

Foxx
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller

Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Oberholte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler

Rice (SC)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyn
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young
Zeldin

NAYS—221

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Courtney
Craig

Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Españillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries

Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahle
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton

Mrvan	Roybal-Allard	Suoizzi
Murphy (FL)	Ruiz	Swalwell
Nadler	Ruppersberger	Takano
Napolitano	Rush	Thompson (CA)
Neal	Ryan	Thompson (MS)
Neguse	Sánchez	Titus
Newman	Sarbanes	Tlaib
Norcross	Scanlon	Tonko
O'Halleran	Schakowsky	Torres (CA)
Ocasio-Cortez	Schiff	Torres (NY)
Omar	Schneider	Trahan
Pallone	Schrader	Trone
Panetta	Schrier	Underwood
Pappas	Scott (VA)	Vargas
Pascrell	Scott, David	Veasey
Payne	Sewell	Vela
Perlmutter	Sherman	Velázquez
Peters	Sherrill	Wasserman
Phillips	Sires	Schultz
Pingree	Slotkin	Waters
Pocan	Smith (WA)	Watson Coleman
Porter	Soto	Welch
Pressley	Spanberger	Wexton
Price (NC)	Speier	Wild
Quigley	Stansbury	Williams (GA)
Raskin	Stanton	Wilson (FL)
Rice (NY)	Stevens	Yarmuth
Ross	Strickland	

NOT VOTING—6

Biggs	Hollingsworth	McClintock
Cloud	Massie	Rodgers (WA)

□ 1115

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Adams (Brown (MD))	Gonzalez, (Vicente)	Nadler (Pallone)
Bass (Cicilline)	(Correa)	Napolitano
Beatty (Kuster)	Gottheimer	(Correa)
Blumenauer	(Panetta)	Neguse
(Beyer)	Granger	(Perlmutter)
Boyle, Brendan F. (Gallego)	(Calvert)	Newman (Clark (MA))
Brown (OH) (Kaptur)	Grijalva (García (IL))	Norman (Wilson (SC))
Brownley	Hagedorn (Carl)	Ocasio-Cortez (García (IL))
(Kuster)	Hayes (Clark (MA))	Pascrell
Bush (Bowman)	Higgins (NY)	(Pallone)
Butterfield	(Bowman)	Payne (Pallone)
(Panetta)	Jayapal (Raskin)	Pingree
Carter (LA)	Keating (Clark (MA))	(Cicilline)
(Jeffries)	Kelly (IL)	Pocan (Raskin)
Cawthorn (Nehls)	(Kuster)	Porter (Wexton)
Chu (Clark (MA))	Kildee (Panetta)	Reed (Kelly (PA))
Cleaver (Davids (KS))	Kilmer (Bera)	Rogers (KY)
Clyburn	Kinzing	(Reschenthaler)
(Panetta)	(Meijer)	Roybal-Allard
Cohen (Beyer)	Kirkpatrick	(Levin (CA))
Costa (Correa)	(Pallone)	Ruiz (Correa)
Crawford	Krishnamoorthi	Ruppersberger
(Stewart)	(Bera)	(Raskin)
Crist (Soto)	Lawrence	Rush (Kaptur)
Cuellar (Correa)	(Stevens)	Schneider
Davis, Danny K. (García (IL))	Lawson (FL)	(Connolly)
DeFazio (Brown (MD))	(Soto)	Schrier
DeGette (Blunt)	Lee (CA)	(Spanberger)
Rochester	(Khanna)	Scott, David
Demings (Soto)	Lofgren (Jeffries)	(Jeffries)
DeSaulnier	Loudermilk	Sires (Pallone)
(Beyer)	(Fleischmann)	Swalwell
Doggett (Raskin)	Lowenthal	(Gomez)
Doyle, Michael F. (Connolly)	(Beyer)	Timmons
Duncan (Rice (SC))	Lynch (Trahan)	(Armstrong)
Evans (Mfume)	Maloney,	Titus (Connolly)
Fallon (Gooden)	Carolyn B. (Wasserman)	Trone (Brown (MD))
Fletcher (Allred)	Schultz	Van Drew
Fortenberry	McBath (Allred)	(Reschenthaler)
(Moolenaar)	McCollum (Blunt)	Vargas (Correa)
Frankel, Lois (Clark (MA))	Rochester	Vela (Correa)
Garamendi	McEachin	Velázquez (Clark (MA))
(Sherman)	(Wexton)	Waters (Takano)
Gohmert (Weber (TX))	Meng (Kuster)	Watson Coleman
	Moore (UT)	(Pallone)
	(Meijer)	Welch (Raskin)
	Moore (WI)	Wilson (FL)
	(Beyer)	(Cicilline)
	Moulton (Clark (MA))	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SCANLON). The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BOST. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 265, nays 163, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

YEAS—265

Adams	Fortenberry	Manning
Aguilar	Poster	Mast
Allred	Frankel, Lois	Matsui
Amodei	Gaetz	McBath
Auchincloss	Gallego	McCaul
Axne	Garamendi	McCollum
Barragán	Garbarino	McEachin
Bass	García (CA)	McGovern
Beatty	García (IL)	McKinley
Bera	García (TX)	McNerney
Beyer	Golden	Meeks
Bilirakis	Gomez	Meijer
Bishop (GA)	Gonzalez (OH)	Meng
Blumenauer	Gonzalez,	Mfume
Blunt Rochester	Vicente	Miller-Meeks
Bonamici	Gottheimer	Moore (WI)
Bourdeaux	Green, Al (TX)	Morelle
Bowman	Grijalva	Moulton
Boyle, Brendan F.	Harder (CA)	Mrvan
Brown (MD)	Hartzler	Murphy (FL)
Brown (OH)	Hayes	Nadler
Brownley	Herrera Beutler	Napolitano
Bush	Higgins (NY)	Neal
Bustos	Himes	Neguse
Butterfield	Horsford	Newman
Calvert	Houlahan	Norcross
Carbajal	Hoyer	O'Halleran
Cárdenas	Huffman	Obernolte
Carson	Issa	Ocasio-Cortez
Carter (LA)	Jackson Lee	Omar
Cartwright	Jacobs (CA)	Pallone
Case	Jacobs (NY)	Panetta
Casten	Jayapal	Pappas
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	Pascrell
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Payne
Cherfilus-	Johnson (TX)	Pence
McCormick	Jones	Perlmutter
Chu	Joyce (OH)	Peters
Cicilline	Joyce (PA)	Phillips
Clark (MA)	Kahale	Pingree
Clarke (NY)	Kaptur	Pocan
Cleaver	Katko	Porter
Clyburn	Keating	Posey
Cohen	Keller	Pressley
Cole	Kelly (IL)	Price (NC)
Connolly	Kelly (PA)	Quigley
Cooper	Khanna	Raskin
Correa	Kildee	Reed
Costa	Kilmer	Reschenthaler
Courtney	Kim (CA)	Rice (NY)
Craig	Kim (NJ)	Ross
Crist	Kind	Roybal-Allard
Crow	Kinzing	Ruiz
Cuellar	Kirkpatrick	Ruppersberger
Curtis	Krishnamoorthi	Rush
Davids (KS)	Kuster	Ryan
Davis, Danny K.	Lamb	Sánchez
Dean	Langevin	Sarbanes
DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Scanlon
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky
DeLauro	Lawrence	Schiff
DeBene	Lawson (FL)	Schneider
Delgado	Lee (CA)	Schrader
Demings	Lee (NV)	Schrier
DeSaulnier	Leger Fernandez	Scott (VA)
DesJarlais	Levin (CA)	Scott, David
Deutsch	Levin (MI)	Sewell
Dingell	Lieu	Sherman
Doggett	Lofgren	Sherrill
Doyle, Michael F.	Long	Sires
Escobar	Lowenthal	Slotkin
Eshoo	Luria	Smith (NJ)
Españat	Lynch	Smith (WA)
Evans	Malinowski	Soto
Fitzpatrick	Malliotakis	Spanberger
Fletcher	Maloney,	Speier
	Carolyn B.	Stansbury
	Maloney, Sean	Stanton

Steel	Torres (NY)	Waters
Stevens	Trahan	Watson Coleman
Strickland	Trone	Welch
Suoizzi	Underwood	Wexton
Swalwell	Upton	Wild
Takano	Valadao	Williams (GA)
Thompson (CA)	Vargas	Wilson (FL)
Thompson (MS)	Veasey	Wittman
Thompson (PA)	Vela	Yarmuth
Titus	Velázquez	Young
Tlaib	Walorski	Zeldin
Tonko	Wasserman	
Torres (CA)	Schultz	

NAYS—163

Aderholt	Franklin, C.	Miller (WV)
Allen	Scott	Moolenaar
Armstrong	Fulcher	Mooney
Arrington	Gallagher	Moore (AL)
Babin	Gibbs	Moore (UT)
Bacon	Gimenez	Mullin
Baird	Gohmert	Murphy (NC)
Balderson	Gonzales, Tony	Nehls
Banks	Good (VA)	Newhouse
Barr	Gooden (TX)	Owens
Bentz	Gosar	Palazzo
Bergman	Granger	Palmer
Bice (OK)	Graves (LA)	Perry
Bishop (NC)	Graves (MO)	Pfluger
Boebert	Green (TN)	Rice (SC)
Bost	Greene (GA)	Rodgers (WA)
Brady	Griffith	Rogers (AL)
Brooks	Grothman	Rogers (KY)
Buchanan	Guest	Rose
Buck	Guthrie	Rosendale
Budget	Hagedorn	Rouzer
Bucshon	Harris	Roy
Budd	Harshbarger	Rutherford
Burchett	Hern	Salazar
Burgess	Herrell	Scalise
Cammack	Hice (GA)	Schweikert
Carey	Higgins (LA)	Scott, Austin
Carl	Hill	Sessions
Carter (GA)	Hinson	Simpson
Carter (TX)	Hudson	Smith (MO)
Cawthorn	Huizenga	Smith (NE)
Chabot	Jackson	Smucker
Cheney	Johnson (LA)	Spartz
Cline	Johnson (OH)	Stauber
Cloud	Johnson (SD)	Stefanik
Clyde	Jordan	Steil
Comer	Kelly (MS)	Steube
Crawford	Kustoff	Stewart
Crenshaw	LaHood	Taylor
Davidson	LaMalfa	Tenney
Davis, Rodney	Lamborn	Tiffany
Diaz-Balart	Latta	Timmons
Donalds	LaTurner	Turner
Duncan	Lesko	Van Drew
Dunn	Letlow	Van Dyne
Ellzey	Loudermilk	Wagner
Emmer	Lucas	Walberg
Estes	Luetkemeyer	Waltz
Fallon	Mace	Weber (TX)
Feenstra	Mann	Webster (FL)
Ferguson	McCarthy	Wenstrup
Fischbach	McClain	Westerman
Fitzgerald	McHenry	Williams (TX)
Fleischmann	Meuser	Wilson (SC)
Foxx	Miller (IL)	Womack

NOT VOTING—5

Biggs	Massie	Norman
Hollingsworth	McClintock	

□ 1135

Ms. GRANGER changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Adams (Brown (MD))	Brownley	Clyburn
Bass (Cicilline)	(Kuster)	(Panetta)
Beatty (Kuster)	Bush (Bowman)	Cohen (Beyer)
Blumenauer	Butterfield	Costa (Correa)
(Beyer)	(Panetta)	Crawford
Boyle, Brendan F. (Gallego)	Carter (LA)	(Stewart)
Brown (OH)	(Jeffries)	Crist (Soto)
(Kaptur)	Cawthorn (Nehls)	Cuellar (Correa)
	Chu (Clark (MA))	Davis, Danny K.
	Cleaver (Davids (KS))	(García (IL))

DeFazio (Brown (MD))	Kinzinger (Meijer)	Pascarell (Pallone)
DeGette (Blunt Rochester)	Kirkpatrick (Pallone)	Payne (Pallone)
Demings (Soto)	Krishnamoorthi (Bera)	Pingree (Cicilline)
DeSaulnier (Beyer)	Lawrence (Stevens)	Pocan (Raskin)
Doggett (Raskin)	Lawson (FL) (Soto)	Porter (Wexton)
Doyle, Michael F. (Connolly)	Lee (CA) (Khanna)	Reed (Kelly (PA))
Duncan (Rice (SC))	Lofgren (Jeffries)	Rogers (KY) (Reschenthaler)
Evans (Mfume)	Loudermilk (Fleischmann)	Roybal-Allard (Levin (CA))
Fallon (Gooden)	Lowenthal (Beyer)	Ruiz (Correa)
Fletcher (Allred)	Lynch (Trahan)	Ruppersberger (Raskin)
Fortenberry (Moolenaar)	Maloney, Carolyn B. (Wasserman)	Rush (Kaptur)
Frankel, Lois (Clark (MA))	Schultz	Schneider (Connolly)
Garamendi (Sherman)	McBath (Allred)	Schrier (Spanberger)
Gohmert (Weber (TX))	McCollum (Blunt)	Scott, David (Jeffries)
Gonzalez, Vicente (Correa)	Rochester)	Sires (Pallone)
Gotthelmer (Panetta)	McEachin (Wexton)	Swallow (Gomez)
Granger (Calvert)	Meng (Kuster)	Timmons (Armstrong)
Grijalva (Garcia (IL))	Moore (UT) (Meijer)	Titus (Connolly)
Hagedorn (Carl)	Moore (WI) (Beyer)	Trone (Brown (MD))
Hayes (Clark (MA))	Moulton (Clark (MA))	Van Drew (Reschenthaler)
Higgins (NY) (Bowman)	Nadler (Pallone)	Vargas (Correa)
Jayapal (Raskin)	Napolitano (Correa)	Vela (Correa)
Keating (Clark (MA))	Neguse (Perlmutter)	Velázquez (Clark (MA))
Kelly (IL) (Kuster)	Newman (Clark (MA))	Waters (Takano)
Kildee (Panetta)	Ocasio-Cortez (Garcia (IL))	Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Kilmer (Bera)		Welch (Raskin)
		Wilson (FL) (Cicilline)

HONORING DETECTIVE JAMES STANKO

(Ms. WILD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Allentown Police Detective and Community Liaison Officer James Stanko, a man who dedicated his life's work to bridging the divide between police officers and the community they serve.

Officer Stanko died on Monday, a huge loss for our community, but his legacy lives on through the countless lives he touched.

Officer Stanko wasn't known for sitting idly at a desk. His passions lay out in the community where he was known for mentoring our kids, whether it was through coaching basketball, talking at schools, or offering life lessons at the children's clinic.

As someone who worked closely with him put it, "Our kids called him family." He was a calming, yet dependable force that everyone, especially our youth, could turn to for guidance and support.

Officer Stanko never stopped trying to achieve his ultimate goal of connecting the police department to the people that it serves.

Working as an Allentown police officer for 13 years, Stanko never wavered in his values of honesty, integrity, and, most notably, respect for others. I was inspired by his sincere love for public service, as well as his passion for our community that he was proud to call home. He will be deeply missed.

HONORING DIVISION CHAMPS CLINTON-MASSIE FALCONS

(Mr. CAREY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, as a Clinton County native, I rise today in honor of the 2021 Division IV Ohio high school football State champion, the Clinton-Massie Falcons.

On December 3, 2021, the Clinton-Massie Falcons defeated the Youngstown Ursuline Irish in a thrilling comeback victory that one would expect to see in a movie.

Trailing 28-7 late in the third quarter, the Falcons kept their poise and refused to be denied. They shut down the Irish offense while scoring on three straight possessions. The Falcon's final touchdown came on a fourth and goal from the 1-yard line with under 1 minute to play.

With the score 28-27, the team didn't think twice when given the choice. They went for 2 points and the win to bring home the school's third State championship in just under 10 years.

To Coach Dan McSurley and every player on the Falcon roster, congratulations. As a former captain of the East Clinton Astro football team, I understand the obstacles that you have had to overcome to earn this title. You have made our county proud and proven that hard work and determination truly pay off.

INVESTING IN INFRASTRUCTURE

(Mr. CÁRDENAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, thanks to President Biden's Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act that I and many of us voted for, we are now putting those resources on the ground across America.

The first billions of dollars to go to California and every State in the Union are now being put in place to fix bridges. Next, we are going to fix our roads and build our infrastructure to electrify our system throughout the country.

These are the kinds of things that our voters sent us to Washington to do, to bring those resources back to every single community, every single one of our communities, and that is what we are doing here in Congress with a President who actually believes in the fundamentals of infrastructure and making sure that we put our American workers back to work to build our Nation as it should be and what we are so proud of.

We are the number one infrastructure place in the world, and we will continue to be so with these investments.

ONE YEAR OF CRISES

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to ad-

dress the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 1-year anniversary of President Biden's inauguration and 1 year under one-party rule.

And I ask: Is America better off? The answer is no.

Since President Biden took office, we have seen crisis after crisis.

We are facing an economic crisis. President Biden and the Democrats had the tools to bring our economy back to the prepandemic records of 2019. But instead, we have massive supply shortages, labor shortages, and an inflation rate that has reached a 40-year high.

Our country faces an energy crisis. We went from being energy independent to begging OPEC+ to produce more oil to offset the rising costs. This is because of anti-American energy policies enacted over the past year.

Mr. Speaker, the list goes on: an education crisis as our youth continue to face uncertainty in the classroom; a national security crisis as our presence on the world stage has been weakened and our southern border remains vulnerable; and a crime crisis following dangerous defund the police rhetoric.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the leadership America needs right now. In fact, it is far from it.

□ 1145

INFRASTRUCTURE AND JOBS

(Ms. UNDERWOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, today marks one year of Democrats in Congress working alongside the Biden-Harris administration on behalf of American families.

I am proud of what we have accomplished so far, including the once-in-a-generation investment in our roads and bridges made by the bipartisan infrastructure law. With nearly 2,500 bridges in poor condition, Illinois ranks third among States with crumbling bridge infrastructure. Thanks to the bipartisan infrastructure law, Illinois will receive \$1.4 billion to repair and rebuild these bridges, like the Blackberry Creek and Mendota railroad bridges in my district.

These upgrades will save Illinoisans money on costly car repairs and time on their daily commutes. This long-overdue investment will also connect our communities and support our supply chain, while creating good-paying jobs and spurring economic development.

With the partnership of the Biden-Harris administration, we have spent the last 365 days delivering for the American people. Our work is far from finished.

COMMEMORATION OF DR. MARCY ZWELLING

(Mr. SESSIONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today out of great respect and mourn the loss of Dr. Marcy Zwelling from California.

Dr. Zwelling, since 2012, has headed up the National Physicians Council for Healthcare Policy, which is a group of some 570 independent physicians across the country. Dr. Zwelling not only challenged me but challenged all 570 members of the Physicians Council to please advocate on behalf of not only patients but also physicians. She dedicated her service and life not only to patients, attempting to give them the very best of medical help, but also for physicians. Physicians who many times are faced with innumerable challenges, not just to provide service but also in their own lives.

So it is today I offer to the House of Representatives the great life of Dr. Marcy Zwelling who passed away this last weekend. May she rest in peace. May God bless her life and that which she gave each of us.

Whether she was helping organize one of the over nine conferences of the National Physicians Council for Healthcare Policy nationwide, developing new screening tools for patients with cancer, or supporting her fellow physicians, Dr. Zwelling served as an inspiration and servant leader for myself and so many others in the medical community. I will miss her leadership and inspiration.

THE NATION IS CRYING OUT FOR DEMOCRACY

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the name of Dr. Martin Luther King and John Robert Lewis, our late colleague.

I rise today to say that we are not finished. The work of this Nation is not finished, even in the aftermath of a sinister vote on the floor of the United States Senate that could not see clearly to determine that the Constitution and the right to vote rose above the silly and insignificant rule of the Senate called the filibuster.

In the midst of that debate, we heard eloquent and beautiful statements about the many times the filibuster had been eliminated or relieved. We heard a brilliant analysis of the Constitution and the Founding Fathers' desire for the filibuster not to be in the Constitution, yet due process and the 15th Amendment are.

Mr. Speaker, we saw justice crushed and democracy gored. In Texas, of course, more criminal laws are now related to voting. Poll watchers can attack voters in terms of what they are doing. We are now in a constitutional hearing in Judiciary. It is my commit-

ment to go forward on the John Robert Lewis and all the bills attached to it because the Nation is crying out for justice. The country is crying out for democracy. We will not let it down. The Senate must continue its debate, and we must get these bills passed.

PRESIDENT BIDEN'S BORDER CRISIS

(Mr. PALAZZO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind the American people that today marks President Biden's one year in office and 365 days of his disastrous failure at our southern border.

Forty percent of Americans graded Joe Biden's immigration policy with a big fat F for his failures. His open border policy has proven month after month to be not only unsuccessful but downright dangerous for the American people.

More deadly fentanyl products have been smuggled into our neighborhoods this year than ever before. Nearly 11,000 pounds were apprehended in the last year alone.

Biden's wide open southern border is poisoning our communities and causing unthinkable harm. His bad policy is taking lives. It is no surprise that our Nation's number of overdoses reached an all-time high in 2021. My heart breaks for the parents who have lost their children while our President plays politics.

Mr. Speaker, I have said it before, and I will say it again. Border security is national security. It is time to stop deliberately destroying the safety of innocent Americans for the sake of politics.

POSTAL SERVICE DISRUPTIONS

(Mr. CASTEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CASTEN. Mr. Speaker, almost a year ago, I spoke here about the delays in our postal system, and a year later the calls to our office have not stopped. In fact, they have gotten more frequent and more frantic.

Since the start of this year, 50 percent of all the phone calls our office has received are about disruptions in the Postal Service. These are from seniors whose essential medications and Social Security checks were over 2 weeks delayed; folks with missing credit card statements, Medicare cards, past due still undelivered bills accruing interest that they can't pay because their paycheck hasn't come in; small business owners reliant on the mail who are completely unable to operate.

Now, to be sure, the pandemic contributes to some of this. It has increased demand on the mail system, even as postal workers are staying home, quarantining, looking after

loved ones. While leaders in the private sector have adapted to this moment, Postmaster DeJoy has responded to this by eliminating overtime, closing mail processing facilities, and removing mail sorting machines. He has made things worse.

Now, in the private sector we would fix that. A corporate board wouldn't tolerate it. They would hold this man to account. That hasn't happened because we still don't have a fully staffed Postal Board of Governors thanks to the Senate's failure to confirm President Biden's nominations. This is no way to run a business. It is no way to treat the American people.

The Postal Service needs leaders as committed to public service as our letter carriers and mail handlers. Frankly, so does the U.S. Senate. It is time for them to act, to confirm these nominees and ensure the post office has a fully staffed and fully functioning board.

RECOGNIZING LAUREN GOLLOFON

(Mr. ROSENDALE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and commend Lauren Gollofon from Bozeman, Montana. Lauren is a 17-year-old senior at Liberty Online Academy and a former student at Bozeman High School. When Lauren became aware that the Pledge of Allegiance was not being said daily in public schools in Bozeman, she sprang into action. Lauren notified school administrators that their failure to hold the Pledge of Allegiance every day violated Montana House Bill 543, and asked that they hold the Pledge of Allegiance daily in accordance with the State law.

Within a week of her advocacy, local schools began to recite the Pledge of Allegiance daily. When asked why this was so important, Lauren said patriotism is on the decline in the United States. When students say the Pledge of Allegiance, they are acknowledging the freedom and the values and also everyone who has died and fought for our country.

This display of patriotism demonstrates why a report just this year found that Montana is one of the most patriotic States in the Nation, a ranking which we are extremely proud of.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all Montanans, I want to sincerely thank Lauren Gollofon for her leadership, community activism, and her dedication to the core principles that make this country great.

RECOGNIZING BOB BRIGGS

(Mr. PERLMUTTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Bob Briggs of

Westminster, Colorado, who passed away on December 2, 2021.

Bob was born December 24, 1937, in Greeley, Colorado, as one of eight children and the oldest son. His family moved to Westminster in 1943 where Bob graduated from Westminster High School.

He earned a bachelor's degree and a master's degree from Colorado State University, both in horticulture. According to a January 2020 profile in Orchard Living, he majored in horticulture because he did not want to wear a tie for a living.

Bob married his wife, Shirley, on September 8, 1957. He had a long career in local and State politics, serving as Adams County Commissioner for 4 years, beginning in 1979—where he actually helped me on one of my very first cases that I had as a lawyer—as the local board member for the Regional Transportation District for 4 years in 1999, and a State representative for District 29 from January 2003 to 2005. He served terms on the Westminster City Council, including a stint as mayor pro tem. He was a longtime proponent of local rail and helped found the advocacy group Rocky Mountain Rail.

Mr. Speaker, Bob was a devoted husband and a loving father and grandfather. He and Shirley raised two children and enjoyed spending time with their grandchildren. I am deeply grateful for his lifetime of service to our community.

UNITED STATES AID TO TALIBAN

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, under recent comments President Biden made about his first year, he talked about under-promising and over-delivering.

Given what the year looks like, please, Mr. President, under-deliver.

Mr. Speaker, our country has seen unprecedented crisis and record inflation, supply chain disruptions, price surges, gas and energy costs going through the roof, food supply shortages, empty shelves everywhere, higher prices.

Unfortunately, the failures of Biden's first year in office isn't limited to just the United States alone. No, he hastily evacuated our troops from Afghanistan, leaving behind as many as 14,000 U.S. citizens and legal residents and friends, as well as billions of dollars of countless weapons of ours that have fallen into the hands of the Taliban. So over 20 years of a record of Taliban and they get all these weapons to use against us or our friends in the neighborhood.

If this is not bad enough, the administration is now proposing to send over \$300 million in foreign aid, basically, to the Taliban regime to do all the great things they have been doing. People in

Afghanistan do need help, but we know the funds or food we send over there will go straight into the wrong hands.

We need to have a better chain of supply to help them than what the Biden administration is proposing. The nonprofit rescue group known as Save Our Allies has been working tirelessly to rescue those left behind by President Biden's disaster over there. They warn that the funds and supplies will not go into the hands of the average Afghan but, instead, straight into the hands of the Taliban. We need to rethink this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KAHELE). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

NEW MEXICO SUPPORTS INFRASTRUCTURE

(Ms. STANSBURY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, the history of New Mexico and our rural communities predate the founding of our great Nation. Our communities carry rich traditions and ways of life, from our tribal communities, to our land grants, to our farmers and ranchers and small towns that dot the plains, mountains, and river valleys of our beautiful State.

They are diverse, resilient, vibrant, and full of grit and determination. For far too long, our rural communities have been left behind in critical infrastructure, which is why I am deeply proud that our bipartisan infrastructure bill is already delivering for New Mexico, investing millions in rural roads, bridges, and airports, broadband, our electric grid, and life-giving water, creating thousands of jobs, and supporting rural economic development across our State, because our rural communities are the backbone of New Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that we are working together to invest in infrastructure, to invest in jobs, and the well-being of our future and our communities.

□ 1200

MARCH FOR LIFE

(Mr. GOOD of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, today marks 1 year of total Democrat control of the Federal Government—1 year of this Biden administration. In addition to all the other disastrous policies and the crises created by this President, it marks another year with 1 million babies being slaughtered in the womb in our country.

Tomorrow we will, once again, march for life here in Washington, DC, and I will be privileged to join that march. May it be the last time that we do that before the Supreme Court rightly over-

turns the brutal, vicious, inhumane, dishonest, and inaccurate interpretation of the highest law of the land—the Constitution—giving the right to terminate a pregnancy in the womb.

Sixty-five million babies have been lost since that happened nearly 50 years ago. These are inventors, these are scientists, these are ministers, and these are healthcare providers who are not serving and helping our country here today.

Equality begins in the womb, and freedom begins in the womb, and the science tells us that life begins in the womb. May the Supreme Court overturn Roe, and may we begin to protect all innocent, precious life in the womb.

SCHOOL DIRECTOR RECOGNITION MONTH

(Ms. SCANLON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, January is School Board Director Recognition Month, and I want to take a moment, as a former school board member and school board president, to recognize the contributions of these unpaid but essential community servants.

In the best of times, being a school board member is challenging, requiring community members to step up and address issues ranging from child development to HR, and from transportation and construction to nutrition and natural disasters. There is never enough money to do everything we would like to for our children, and the number of regulations, mandates, and laws that must be met seems to be never-ending. It often seems like every choice is between two bad alternatives.

As school directors are facing these outsized challenges compounded by a pandemic and political polarization, and the mental health challenges both have brought, I want to acknowledge their Herculean efforts to keep our children, our teachers, and our staff safe and give them every opportunity to succeed.

I want them to know how much their efforts on behalf of our children, our schools, and our communities are appreciated.

LIFE: GOD'S FIRST GIFT

(Mr. WALBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, having done this many times over the course of the past 14 years, to speak on behalf of life itself. It is the first and foremost gift that is given to us, and I think of the over 60 million children who have been taken out of that opportunity.

It is my hope that we will never have to march again for the repeal of Roe v. Wade after the Supreme Court decides but, rather, that we stand and continue to march for life and the freedom of opportunities for individuals to not only

grow and be benefited by the greatness of this country but also to bring the greatness of this country.

Life is a gift of God. It can only be sustained by people who understand that same gift, and I just pray that the Supreme Court and, ultimately, Congress and the legislatures of our land will stand for life.

TRANSPORTATION FUNDING FOR THE PORT OF INDIANA-BURNS HARBOR

(Mr. MRVAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MRVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for Congress to complete the consideration of the fiscal year 2022 appropriations measures prior to the current deadline of February 18. I remain grateful that a transparent process was established for all Members to include eligible projects in these measures.

Notably, for the first District of Indiana, there are projects included that will allow for dredging and improvements at the Port of Indiana-Burns Harbor. This incredible facility is essential to the functions of the north-west Indiana steel and manufacturing industries and supports thousands of steelworker jobs and longshoreman jobs along the way.

Appropriations measures are not just funding numbers and direction for Federal programs and projects. They are a testament to the government's investment that create jobs and grow our economy.

I appreciate the ongoing communications of our appropriations leaders, and I look forward to doing all I can to ensure that these important measures are signed into law as soon as possible.

FORTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF ROE V. WADE

(Mrs. McCLAIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. McCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, this week marks 49 years since the landmark Supreme Court decision of Roe v. Wade, 49 years since the choice won over life in the eyes of the American people.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle applaud Roe v. Wade and have no problem with the more than 62 million innocent babies who have been aborted since 1973.

I, however, find these numbers to be sickening.

These children are just as worthy of life as a fully grown adult is. They are created in the image of God just as you and I are, and their lives should not be carelessly and despicably destroyed.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle preach and parade human rights.

But where is the outrage for equal human rights for the unborn?

It is frighteningly nonexistent, and their lack of consistency makes it very clear what their priorities are.

How can you claim to care for one life when you don't care for all lives, no matter how small?

HEALTHCARE WORKERS

(Mr. FOSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the men and women who have been on the front lines of this pandemic from the very beginning: our healthcare workers. On MLK Day, I had a chance to deliver care packages to hospitals and clinics in my district in Joliet, Aurora, and Naperville as a small token of appreciation for the tireless work of our healthcare workers.

As our Nation confronts this, hopefully final, winter surge of COVID, we should all keep in mind the people who are still going to work every day to care for people who are sick. Their dedication to their jobs is truly inspiring, and they are literally saving lives every day. After almost 2 years of battling COVID, our healthcare workers are mentally and physically exhausted, but yet they still show up every day to provide care for others.

We can all learn so much from them.

I am honored to represent so many of them in my district in places like Edward Hospital in Naperville, Silver Cross Hospital in New Lenox, Rush Copley Medical Center in Aurora, and Aunt Martha's Health Center in Joliet; just to name a few.

So I want every healthcare worker in America—doctors, nurses, and support staff—to know that they are not alone. I thank them for being there.

THE BIDEN ADMINISTRATION'S 1-YEAR REVIEW

(Mr. MEUSER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, in business, a 1-year review is customary. So let's review the Biden administration's first year by the numbers. As we tend to say in business, the numbers don't lie.

Regarding the economy, there are 6 million Americans unemployed while 10 million jobs remain unfilled. The vast majority of small businesses are hiring, yet 95 percent report few applications. Inflation, Mr. Speaker, is at a 40-year high of 7 percent. Gas is up 50 percent, and it costs about \$100 to fill up the gas tank on a pickup truck.

Regarding national security, it is really no better. Two million illegals have crossed our border. Twice as much fentanyl is coming in; we have over 100,000—sadly—fatalities throughout the United States. And we have 125,000 troops preparing to invade Ukraine.

We have 2-mile long lines for COVID testing in my district.

Mr. Speaker, we are not going to hold our breath for corrective action to be taken by the Biden administration;

they have stated how they plan to double down. It will be up to the American people to solve this problem come November.

ROE V. WADE

(Mrs. HARTZLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, as I stand at this podium, I will speak for about 60 seconds, and within those 60 seconds, an unborn baby will lose its life. In fact, in America, an unborn baby will have its life ripped away every 50 seconds through the gruesome procedure of abortion. This is about 630,000 unborn lives lost per year—a number that equals about 80 percent of my congressional district.

This is tragic. God has a plan for these children. They are our brothers, sisters, friends, and loved ones. They are future leaders, nurses, doctors, farmers, and small business owners. But, most importantly, they are human beings with a purpose from our Creator. There is nothing more hideous than taking the life of the most vulnerable in our society.

Forty-nine years ago, the decision made by the Supreme Court in Roe v. Wade has resulted in the death of over 62½ million unborn babies. Despite the three-quarters of Americans who want significant restrictions on abortions, my colleagues across the aisle are still prioritizing their abortion-on-demand agenda.

This is senseless. Together, as a nation, we must make this the last year we speak on this horrible anniversary. We cannot wait another 50 seconds, another 50 months, or another 50 years. Everyone is entitled to the right to life.

VOTING RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KAHELE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ALLRED) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ALLRED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLRED. Mr. Speaker, before I give my speech on voting rights, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA).

HONORING THE LIFE AND MEMORY OF MANUEL T. PADILLA

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, today we honor the life and memory of Manny T. Padilla, a leader in our community and my very, very good friend.

Manny served on many boards, commissions, and organizations in Orange County, and he also served 9 years on the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of Orange County's Board of Directors.

Among his many accomplishments, he was honored as Volunteer of the Year by the University of Georgetown, as well as receiving the Lifetime Achievement Award from the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of the State of California.

Manny's story started in New Mexico when he was 17. Then his high school principal chose two of the best students in his high school to be part of the Boys State program. Manny was one of those students.

He moved to Washington, D.C. later on and attended Georgetown University while he worked for then-Senator Dennis Chavez. Years later he attended law school where he met his wife, Betty, at the same time while working at the Department of Labor. They had four children. And Manny had a very long career in the private sector working for State Farm Insurance.

As we celebrate his life, we know his memory will serve as a great example to this next generation.

Mr. ALLRED. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER).

BRANDON ROAD PROJECT

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share some great news about our efforts to protect Lake Michigan and the rivers and lakes throughout Illinois and the entire Great Lakes region from invasive Asian carp.

Yesterday, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers announced that thanks to the bipartisan Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, \$225 million of new funding is headed to Illinois for the Brandon Road Project. The Brandon Road Lock and Dam on the Des Plaines River in Joliet, Illinois, is the last best line of defense against the spread of this invasive species into waterways not just in Illinois but to lakes and tributaries throughout the entire Great Lakes basin.

The economic and environmental consequences of allowing this infestation to spread would be massive, and that is why securing Federal funding for the Brandon Road Project has been one of my most important priorities for several years.

Last year, I joined my colleagues on the Great Lakes Task Force to urge the Army Corps of Engineers to prioritize the Brandon Road Project. And 3 years ago, I hosted members of the then-Republican-controlled Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for a tour of the Brandon Road site so that they could have a first-person look at the importance of this project.

This injection of much-needed funding means that we can move forward on getting this project done and protecting our waterways, and not just our Great Lakes, but the beautiful lakes and rivers that define the entire

Great Lakes region for generations to come.

I just wish that more of my Republican colleagues had actually voted for the bipartisan infrastructure bill to provide the funding for this great project.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, for decades, Americans have been asking their elected leaders to fix crumbling roads and bridges and modernize our Nation's transportation infrastructure. For decades, politicians of both parties promised to deliver on an infrastructure package. President Trump even promised that he would be the one person to get it done. But he didn't, not even when Republicans controlled the House, Senate, and Presidency.

□ 1215

It was President Biden and this Democratic Congress that finally got it done even though more than 90 percent of my Republican colleagues voted against it. Thanks to this new law, people in my State will benefit from robust Federal investment in the infrastructure that they rely on every day: \$11.2 billion for highway and bridge repairs; \$1.7 billion to make sure that everyone has access to clean drinking water; \$4 billion to enhance public transportation; \$616 million for infrastructure enhancements at Illinois airports; and over \$100 million for broadband internet expansion.

Just last week, the Department of Transportation announced that \$1.4 billion was already on its way to Illinois to repair bridges all across the State. This is the largest investment in our State's bridges since the construction of the Interstate Highway System, and it is just the beginning of the infrastructure investments that will benefit the people of Illinois every day.

I have to say, I look forward to meeting my Republican colleagues at the ribbon cutting ceremonies for all of these projects that they voted against.

Mr. ALLRED. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today to talk about the foundation of our democracy: the right to vote and why we must protect it.

I want to begin just by telling a little bit about me. My story is somewhat unique. I didn't take the traditional path to Congress. Before I got here, I played in the NFL for 5 years as a linebacker for the Tennessee Titans. After hurting my neck, I decided to pursue my other dream, which was to become a voting rights attorney, a civil rights attorney. While I was in law school, I decided to focus on voting rights because of what I saw happening in my home State of Texas where it was becoming harder to vote as the State was becoming more and more diverse.

After I came back to Texas, I worked doing voter protection in 2014, setting up poll watcher programs across the State of Texas, trying to help voters deal with the new voter ID law that

had just been put in place and that I knew was going to deeply impact so many Texans. Then I became a voting rights litigator suing States like Ohio and Wisconsin for the laws that they passed making it harder for the people in their States to vote.

Then I was lucky enough to rejoin the Obama administration and finish out that administration.

I decided to come home and run for Congress in my hometown and my home district where I was born and raised. In 2018, I ran against an opponent who had been unopposed in 2016. I won, and I am now proud to be representing the 32nd Congressional District in Congress.

In that campaign in 2018, I had the distinct honor of having Congressman John Lewis come join me in Dallas. Mr. Lewis is my hero, and to have him with me talking to voters and campaigning with me was, to say the least, surreal. We went on to become colleagues, and I considered him to be a friend and a mentor. I know that without John Lewis, I would not be here today. There would be no Congressional Black Caucus.

So many of us would not be here today were it not for him, the other civil rights leaders, and the foot soldiers who fought for the right to vote. That is why we named this critical piece of legislation after him, the Freedom to Vote: John R. Lewis Act.

Now, this piece of legislation is not coming out of thin air. It is not a Federal takeover. Many of the reforms are intended to address long-held problems with access to the ballot box for many Americans. It is also meant to address the gutting of the Voting Rights Act by the Supreme Court in 2013, and the 440 voting restriction bills across 49 States that have been introduced in recent years.

Many of those bills to restrict the right to vote have become law in States like my own, in Texas, in Georgia, and so many other States. While other pieces address the direct and more recent threat to our democracy, including the counting of votes and the safety and security of election officials, this legislation is necessary for us to save our democracy.

Yes, we have had setbacks in this fight. Yesterday was another one. Not enough of our Republican colleagues in the Senate were brave enough to stand up to President Trump's lies and to vote for the same Voting Rights Act that the Senate had unanimously reauthorized in 2006 that my constituent, a Republican, President George W. Bush, signed in 2006. We were just shy of having enough Democrats in the Senate with enough courage to change the rules so that we could protect our democracy.

But I am here to say today, to all of my constituents and to anyone across the country who is worried about our democracy, that we can't lose hope. We have had setbacks before, just as Mr. Lewis did, and we have come back from

them. The American people have sent us a clear message.

In 2020, 155 million Americans voted in a pandemic. They risked their lives to vote. That is how important it was to them. Campaign finance reform; ending partisan gerrymandering; and expanding access to the ballot by creating national standards around voter registration, early voting, and vote by mail are all necessary for us in our democracy, and they are commonsense ideas that are contained in the Freedom to Vote Act. They will fortify and protect this sacred right.

But let's talk about what is happening in the country because I hear all the time from folks that voting is not difficult; that there has not been a rash of voter suppression laws passed across the country; that this is a Democratic story that is being told.

According to the Brennan Center for Justice, between January 1 and September 27 at least 19 States enacted 33 laws to make it harder for Americans to vote.

Restrictive laws in four States: Georgia, Iowa, Kansas, and Texas, imposed new or more stringent criminal penalties on election officials or other individuals for helping their fellow citizens vote. These new criminal laws would deter election officials and others who assist voters from engaging in ordinary, lawful, and often essential tasks. People in Georgia can now be charged with a crime for handing out water and snacks to voters waiting in line to vote; lines that were created intentionally by restricting other ways to vote.

Montana eliminated election day voter registration, making it harder for new voters or folks who have moved to vote in that State.

Arizona temporarily restricted the powers of their secretary of State to represent them in lawsuits. And the reason? Because that position is held currently by a Democrat.

Other States have shortened the window to apply or the deadline to deliver a mail-in ballot or have eliminated ballot drop boxes and reduced polling places, and the list goes on and on and on.

Mr. Speaker, 155 million Americans voted in 2020, the highest turnout since the 1900 election. The Trump administration itself called it the most secure in American history. Yet, the lies about the election and the attacks on the right to vote have just continued and continued, and that is why I am standing here today.

Because of this new lie, these new laws have been passed, and we are seeing voter suppression taking place in real time in my home State in Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just talk about my home State for a little bit because I hear from a lot of Texans who wonder why voting rights experts like myself say that it is one of the most difficult States in the country to vote.

I want to walk you through just how difficult it is to cast your ballot in my

home State. First, the State of Texas makes it incredibly difficult to register to vote. In order for me to register my neighbors in Dallas County, I need to go to the Dallas County elections department, take a short course, and become deputized as a volunteer deputy registrar. That is just to register my neighbors. After that, I am able to register voters only in Dallas County, and I am only able to do that for 2 years because it is going to expire, and then I have to go back and get it reauthorized.

After I registered that voter which I have done hundreds of times, I have 5 days to deliver the completed form that I filled out with them, or I face criminal penalties; 5 days. So if I lose it, something happens, I will be held criminally liable. If I would like to register voters in both of the counties in my congressional district, Collin County and Dallas County, I would have to go to Collin County and get deputized separately there. If I meet a voter who lives in the city of Dallas but doesn't know what county they live in, because four counties touch the city of Dallas, I would not be able to register them unless I know that I am deputized in their county, whether it be Denton County, Kaufman County, Collin County, Dallas County. I have to figure it out. That is just to register my neighbors as a lawyer, as a voting rights lawyer, for me to help my neighbor get registered.

If a voter would like to participate in the next election, they have to register at least 30 days before that election day. So if, like many young people, you decide that a week out from an election you are fired up, you are ready to go, you want to vote in that election, guess what? You can't. Because you didn't get registered in time.

Unlike many other States where they have same-day voter registration, in Texas you have to have decided 30 days out from the election that you were going to get registered and, hopefully, get through all of those other hoops.

Right now, as we speak, the secretary of State's office is citing a paper shortage as the reason why they can't print out enough voter registration forms, despite dragging their feet for years in expanding online voter registration for Texans. That is all just to get registered, Mr. Speaker. We are not even talking about casting your ballot yet.

So after you have gone through those hoops, after you have gotten registered, you have to then survive the purges of the voter rolls that are going on right now, such as in 2019, when Texas attempted to kick 100,000 Texans—incorrectly—off the voter rolls claiming that they were noncitizens. It was such a disaster the secretary of State had to resign.

Now, if you survived that, if you have gotten registered and you have not been purged from the voter rolls to actually cast your ballot, you have to jump through more hoops because

Texas has the strictest voter ID law in the country. In order for me to vote in the State of Texas, I need to possess one of seven acceptable forms of ID which does include a Texas handgun license but does not include a student ID like my constituents at SMU, or UTD, or any school in Dallas might be issued.

A Texas district court found in 2014 that 600,000 registered Texans or 4.5 percent of those registered at that time lacked one of these qualifying IDs. Now, thanks to a court ruling, you can sign a declaration stating that you don't possess that required form of ID. But that is not often communicated at the polling place. I know because I have trained poll watchers to try and watch for this. When voters present themselves and they don't have the required ID, they are often turned away.

If you have a disability or if you are out of town, or you just have difficulty coming to a polling place, you can't vote by mail very easily either. To vote by mail in the State of Texas you have to be 65 years or older, you have to be sick or disabled, or you have to be out of the county where your election is being held on election day and throughout the entire early voting period.

Recently, thanks to the State's voter suppression law, S.B. 1, this has become even more difficult. As reports from counties from across the State have shown, mail-in ballot applications are being rejected at an alarming rate. That is because this new law requires that people provide either a partial Social Security number or a driver's license number on their application for a mail-in ballot, and that number has to match the identification on their voter registration. This makes it extremely difficult for voters to remember which ID they used when they registered, perhaps decades ago.

In Dallas and Tarrant Counties right now, 40 percent, Mr. Speaker, of the applications have been rejected. In Bexar County where San Antonio is located, it is almost 50 percent. If these rejection rates hold, tens of thousands of mail-in ballots and possibly more will be rejected.

It is now a crime, Mr. Speaker, for county officials to encourage folks to vote by mail, meaning that if you are in a household and you are married and if a spouse requests a mail-in ballot, the county official cannot inform you that your spouse can also request a mail-in ballot if they are eligible or they face criminal penalties. And that doesn't even scratch the surface of dealing with voters whose names have changed because of marriage or divorce, or a change in gender identity, or whose names no longer match the names on the voter roll.

If you possess one of these IDs and if you are aware of your rights, you may still struggle to find a polling place. According to a report from the Leadership Conference Education Fund, 750 polling places have been closed in

Texas since 2012. This has disproportionately happened in counties with large Black and Latino populations.

The law also curbed other initiatives by counties to make voting easier. That happened during the pandemic, including limiting ballot drop boxes, banning counties from drive-through voting, and opening 24-hour voting locations as they did in Harris County where Houston is. They even tried to ban Sunday morning early voting to stop souls to the polls until they had too much outrage and they had to back off.

Texans in minority communities disproportionately face long lines when they get to the polling place in order to vote. This includes one Black man in Houston who waited 6 hours to cast his ballot in 2020.

If you make it through all of those hurdles: register to vote, cast your ballot by mail or in person via early voting or on election day, your vote will then be diluted through aggressive partisan gerrymandering at the State house, State senate, and congressional level.

□ 1230

According to the Brennan Center for Justice, Texas Democrats would have to win 58 percent of the vote to be favored to carry more than 37 percent of the State's congressional seats. That is a State where Joe Biden earned 46.5 percent of the vote.

According to this analysis, Texas would have to vote very heavily for Democrats in order to barely break the gerrymandering, and it would still likely leave Republicans with a 2-to-1 seat advantage.

This is all due to partisan gerrymandering, which allows politicians to choose their voters instead of the other way around.

Gerrymandering doesn't just silence communities, though. It also suppresses the vote. It is well known that competitive elections drive higher turnout, which is why the recent State and congressional maps in Texas sought to limit the number of competitive elections as much as possible.

For the Texas voter that has found a way to register and cast their ballot, and has ignored the impacts of gerrymandering, their vote is still under attack, even after they have cast it.

Currently, right now, as we are 2 months out from the primary election for our next election, our State's leaders are conducting a so-called audit of the 2020 election results in our largest counties at the request of the former President of the United States, trying to prop up the lie that the last election was stolen from him—in a State that he won.

All of these hurdles, combined with the potential discriminatory penalties, are making it difficult for the average Texan to feel that they can engage in an election freely. Even worse, States across the country are following Texas' lead. That is why we need to pass the

Freedom to Vote Act and the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Act.

The Freedom to Vote Act, just very quickly, for folks who are wondering, because there is a lot of discussion about this, this is what it actually does:

It establishes automatic, online, and same-day voter registration, which would solve our voter registration problems in the State of Texas.

It makes election day a Federal holiday, something that should happen.

It sets national standards for early voting and vote by mail, requiring 2 weeks of early voting, including 2 weekends, and allowing any American who wants to, to vote by mail.

It bans partisan gerrymandering and establishes clear, neutral standards and rules as well as increasing transparency and enhanced judicial review. This would address Texas' extremely gerrymandered maps.

It creates a uniform standard for what forms of ID are acceptable for voting.

It prevents States from subverting their own elections and protects election records, legislation that I introduced here in the House that I am glad to see included in this final bill.

Of course, the Voting Rights Act needs to be restored. We need to make sure that we have preclearance again. We need to have a national standard. That is what the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Act does.

This is a bill that passed the Senate 98 to nothing in 2006. It passed the House overwhelmingly. It was signed into law by my constituent, again, George W. Bush, a Republican. Now, not a single Republican in the Senate or in the House will vote for it.

This brings me to my final thoughts. On January 6, I was just a few rows back from where I am standing now. The doors to my right were barricaded with furniture like this, which we use to hold paper, as a mob tried to break in and prevent us from ratifying the results of an American Presidential election.

I along with my colleagues like Mr. JONES, who is here with me, were prepared for the worst. These doors were locked. We didn't know if there would be a way out. But we were determined to do our job.

I think the most important thing that happened on January 6, the thing I hope that people remember that happened, isn't that we had to evacuate the House floor. I hope they remember that we came back.

We came back while there was still blood on the walls, while there was still broken glass on the floor, while we ourselves were dealing with our own emotional response to what had happened. While we ourselves were shaken, we came back and we voted—yes, in a bipartisan way—to affirm an American Presidential election. Our democracy held, just barely.

Since then, we have seen a more clever, slower attempt to accomplish the

same thing that those rioters tried to do on January 6, which is to subvert the will of the American people. We have seen it in State after State.

We have seen the worst rash of voter suppression laws that we have had in this country since the days of Jim Crow. In many ways, it is worse because it is not 1965, Mr. Speaker. It is 2022, and we should have made more progress by now. We shouldn't be having this conversation about whether or not certain Americans should be able to vote in our elections.

We have had this problem since the passage of the 15th Amendment, the idea that certain votes matter more than others, or that votes of certain people who live in certain places are inherently fraudulent, or that they don't know enough to be involved in an election.

I tell you what, I believe in the American people. I believe that they know that our democracy is what makes our country great. Our democracy is what allows us to have this thriving economy.

People are trying everything they can to get into this country still. They are not trying to join some of our autocratic opponents. They are not trying to break into Russia or China. They want to come to the United States. We are still a beacon of hope for the world.

When strongmen and autocrats worry about the United States, it is not just our military they worry about. It is our ideas. It is the idea of the United States. While that idea is under attack, I believe it is going to stand strong.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, to all of my constituents, to anyone who may be listening to this, the fight to protect the right to vote is far from over. The Senate may not have done its job yesterday, but I and my colleagues will not give up that fight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and colleague, Congressman ALLRED, for his leadership in the fight to protect the fundamental right to vote and to save our ailing democracy. It has been an honor working with him, with Congresswoman TERRI SEWELL, and with Congressman JOHN SARBANES over the past year on the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act and the Freedom to Vote Act.

As you just heard, we are living through the worst assault on the right to vote since the Jim Crow era. And yesterday, on the Senate floor, white nationalists used the Jim Crow filibuster to block voting rights legislation.

But they did not win the contest for the soul of our Nation. I rise to affirm that we the people aren't giving up that easily. We never give up.

We the people didn't give up when, after we finally ended the scourge of slavery in this Nation, white nationalists fought back, violently unraveling Reconstruction, throwing duly elected

Black people out of office, and barring Black voters from the voting booth for generations. We responded by organizing.

Progress came in fits. It took us nearly a century, but progress came.

It came in the courtroom where Thurgood Marshall helped to end a century of legalized segregation.

It came on the streets, where the March on Washington and the Montgomery bus boycott produced meaningful social change.

Of course, it came in Congress where, after considerable pressure from the civil rights movement, this Chamber and the Senate passed the Voting Rights Act into law, and they overcame a filibuster to do it. Imagine that.

Mr. Speaker, like you, I was hoping against all hope that today's story would end the same way, with a majority of Senators doing the right thing.

To those of you watching at home, to the millions of you who put it all on the line to save our democracy, to see the Freedom to Vote: John R. Lewis Act become law, I feel your pain right now. But I do not despair. As Sherrilyn Ifill, the director-counsel of the NAACP's Legal Defense Fund, said recently: No story in the history of our quest for racial justice has ever ended with the words: "And then they gave up."

Our story, the story of building a true, multiracial democracy in the 21st century, is no exception. The fact is, progress is not always linear. It is messy. There are false starts. There are setbacks, like what happened last night. But the weight of history and the force of reason are on our side.

I grew up in the Baptist Church. To quote from the book of Jeremiah: Like a fire shut up in my bones, I know that goodness will prevail.

As the elders used to say: Trouble don't last always. Weeping may endureth for a night, but joy—joy—cometh in the morning.

Look at how far we have come already. Just a few years ago, democracy reform was a pipe dream embraced by only the most committed activists. But thanks to an overwhelming groundswell of energy, of movement building, of organizing, the Freedom To Vote: John R. Lewis Act passed the House, and it came just two votes short of passing the Senate.

We are not going anywhere. We are more energized than ever to see this through. We must pick up Senate seats this fall to make the filibuster an impossibility.

This is the fight of our lives, for our climate, for healthcare, our jobs, our dignity under the law, our future. We have no choice but to keep going.

I am reminded of the words of Dr. King in his 1966 speech in Kingstree, South Carolina:

"Let us march on ballot boxes, for this is the way we are going to straighten up . . . the Nation.

"Let us march on ballot boxes until somehow we will be able to develop

that day when men will have food and material necessities for their bodies, freedom and dignity for their spirits, education and culture for their minds.

"Let us march on ballot boxes so that men and women will no longer walk the streets in search of jobs that do not exist.

"Let us march on ballot boxes until the empty stomachs . . . are filled.

"Let us march on ballot boxes until the idle industries of Appalachia are revitalized.

"Let us march on ballot boxes until 'brotherhood' is more than a meaningless word at the end of a prayer but the first order of business on every legislative agenda.

"Let us march on ballot boxes."

Dr. King's words are as true today as they were nearly 60 years ago. But while our work must include the ballot box, we know that it also must go beyond it. We must envision the world as we want it, and we must do everything in our power to bring about that world.

Hold your elected officials accountable. Educate your friends, your family, your neighbors. Change their hearts and minds.

Mr. Speaker, unlike John Lewis and his generation, we are not called to risk our lives. We are merely called to exercise the rights that they helped to win: our votes and our voices.

Like those before us, let us march on.

□ 1245

REMEMBERING LANI GUINIER

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, as we grieve the demise of democracy legislation in the Senate last night, I rise in grief and in gratitude to honor my beloved teacher, the legendary Lani Guinier, who passed away earlier this month.

Lani Guinier's life defies summary. She began her career in the civil rights division at the Department of Justice. She led voting rights advocacy at the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, often driving alone at night through hostile places, like from Selma to Mobile, Alabama, to win 31 of the 32 cases she argued. Due to her intellect and her sterling record of accomplishment, she was nominated to lead the Civil Rights Division at the Department of Justice. She would go on to become the first woman of color tenured at Harvard Law School.

But like many great civil rights leaders, Lani Guinier did not define herself by the power she held or the acclaim she received. She defined herself by the power she unleashed within her clients, her students, and the American people. Lani Guinier found her voice by helping others find theirs.

I am blessed that she helped me find my voice. So the day after the Senate tried to silence the voices of the American people, it feels fitting to honor her by speaking from the floor of the people's House.

I first met Professor Guinier when I was in college. I was taking a writing course, and with her characteristic

generosity, she agreed to let me interview her. At the time, I wanted to be a civil rights lawyer like my friend, COLIN ALLRED. That warm evening, the Sun still glowing in the sky, she illuminated a different path forward for me. She revealed to me that civil rights advocacy was about so much more than litigation, as important as that is. It was also about leveraging the power of impacted communities to transform entire institutions. Without meaning to, she helped persuade me to become a legislator.

When I arrived at law school, Professor Guinier taught me more than I could ever have expected, not just everything I know about voting rights law, but also how to become the person I hoped to be.

As the first woman of color to be tenured at Harvard Law School, Professor Guinier showed us that being a first is not a privilege but a responsibility—a lesson that is not lost on me as one of the first openly gay Black Members of Congress.

Her scholarship sought to show that every voice belonged in our constitutional conversation. Not just John Marshall, but Thurgood Marshall. Not just lawyers like Constance Baker Motley, but activists like Fannie Lou Hamer. Not just the people whose names make the history books, but the seemingly ordinary people living lives of extraordinary service.

While most law professors obsess over jurisprudence—what judges do, say, and think—Professor Guinier opened our eyes to demosprudence, the law that emerges from and enhances the power of the people. She knew that justice is not the work of Justices alone.

At heart, Professor Guinier was a democratic idealist, a prophetic voice who called us to reconstruct our democratic institutions and reimagine our democratic identities. She cautioned us that winner-take-all elections risk converting political competition into mutually assured destruction, intensifying conflict and underrepresenting those already underrepresented.

She helped Congress reinvigorate section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, work the Supreme Court subverted last year in *Brnovich v. DNC*, and which I was proud to help restore by introducing the Inclusive Elections Act, which we passed in the House but, unfortunately, the Senate rejected last night through the filibuster.

After the Court demolished the Voting Rights Act's foundation in *Shelby v. Holder* in 2013, she urged Congress to not only repair the damage—as we did in the House, but as was blocked last night by the Jim Crow filibuster—but she also encouraged us to guarantee an affirmative right to vote. I have been honored to answer that call by introducing the Right to Vote Act, which also passed the House last week as part of the Freedom to Vote: John R. Lewis Act.

Beyond prescribing specific reforms and remedies, Professor Guinier urged

us to see that democracy was not a zero-sum war over the power to dominate but, rather, a delicate project of sharing power with one another as equals. "Living in a democracy," she said, "is not something we inherit. It is not something we inhabit, and it is not something that we consume. It is something we actively build together."

Just as the Senate refused to heed the will of the people last night, the powerful did not always heed Professor Guinier. But she knew the power of dissent. Whether dissenters speak from the bench, from the lectern like this one, or from the streets, what seems like their weakness is really their strength. The powerful coerce us to do their bidding, but dissenters call us forward to freely do what is right.

I am heartbroken by Professor Guinier's passing. I miss her.

But Professor Guinier, even now, shows me that accepting myself as I am can help me to center the people I serve. She inspires me to protect and perfect our multiracial democracy. I once asked her how to advance that mission in today's times. She said, "I think that is the question for your generation." With our democracy on the line, may we, the people, lift every voice to answer.

Mr. ALLRED. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for his words.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities against Members of the United States Senate.

MARCH FOR LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I will be brief, and I will speak at the end of the Special Order as well if there is time.

Mr. Speaker, in 1973 the U.S. Supreme Court abandoned women and babies to what is now the multibillion dollar abortion industry, and almost 63½ million unborn children have been killed, a staggering loss of children's lives that is more than the entire population of Italy.

Now, by at least affirming the constitutionality of the Mississippi law after 15 weeks, which we are all hoping and praying for, the Supreme Court may finally take a powerful step towards inclusion, respect, and justice for the weakest and most vulnerable nearly 50 years after the infamous findings of *Roe v. Wade*.

Tomorrow thousands will march for life here in the capital and across the country.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS), who is a medical doctor, an anesthesiologist at Johns

Hopkins, and co-chairman of the Pro-Life Caucus.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with the hope that after nearly 50 years, *Roe v. Wade*'s attack on the most basic of human rights, the right to life, will soon meet its end.

Why are we going to be marching tomorrow? We do it because we believe that every person, born and unborn, deserves a chance at life. We march to shed light on the incredible resources available to expectant mothers who find themselves in desperate situations. We march to send a message that humanity cannot sit by and quietly tolerate the deliberate ending of human life.

Mr. Speaker, I am a physician, and I have helped thousands of women deliver their babies over the course of my career. When I underwent my training, I was taught that caring for expectant mothers meant caring for two patients, not one. As you can see here, advances in ultrasound technology have reinforced that training from decades ago. Mr. Speaker, these are not blobs of tissue we are talking about. These are human beings. The science is clear: From the moment of conception, new human life enters the world with its own unique DNA, and in a matter of weeks even a heartbeat.

Mr. Speaker, we march for an end to the human tragedy of abortion, and I pray each day that we come closer to this righteous conclusion.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH), co-chair of the Pro-Life Caucus.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my great friend, Mr. SMITH, and a great fighter for life for many years, and we appreciate all of his work on that.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the 49th anniversary of the *Roe v. Wade* tragedy and to remember the more than 60 million unborn lives it has taken and the tragic, irreversible mark it has left on countless mothers, fathers, and families.

Every innocent life is precious, from conception until natural death, but for nearly five decades abortion has remained one of the greatest tragedies of our Nation.

The Supreme Court now has the opportunity to right some of the terrible wrongs committed in this country against the unborn since *Roe v. Wade*. I pray for our Justices, that they make the right decision, for many lives will depend on it.

We will continue to fight for the lives of unborn children.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mrs. FISCHBACH for her powerful and eloquent witness for life, both in the legislature in Minnesota and now in the U.S. House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT). I would note that he is the prime author of two breakthrough laws. One is called the Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act, which

is law, and the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his long-time leadership in protecting innocent, unborn lives. He was here at the beginning. The fathers of the pro-life movement here in the United States Congress were CHRIS SMITH and Henry Hyde.

Speaking of Henry Hyde, we have had for a long time something called the Hyde amendment, which basically said U.S. tax dollars could not go to pay for abortions, but we have a radical pro-abortion group of people that control this Congress now. They think that tax dollars ought to go to pay for other people's abortions.

They also believe that not only should we pay for abortions here in the United States with the people's tax dollars, but they ought to pay for abortions across the globe, and that is a reversal of the Mexico City policy.

The Supreme Court is currently considering two cases that may fundamentally alter abortion in this country, and it is my hope, my sincere hope, that this Court will finally right a grievous past wrong and give the rights to the most vulnerable among us, the unborn, and protect lives in the future rather than what has happened in the slaughter of over 63 million of our fellow citizens.

I want to thank Mr. SMITH and all the other Members who will be speaking here today for their leadership on this vital, vital issue.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to just say how much I appreciate the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for having this very, very valuable worthwhile Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of the 63 million babies who have tragically been aborted since the Supreme Court's devastating decision in *Roe v. Wade*.

However, in the 49 years since that fatal decision, science has unmistakably proven that unborn babies can feel pain as early as 15 weeks. They even have a character. We can see it on sonograms.

But the left likes to ignore this fact. They seem to only value the type of science that supports their political agenda. It is time for the "party of science" to actually follow the science and to protect the unborn.

I will always fight for life. I am proud to be up here with my colleagues today standing up for these unborn, innocent, little human beings. I sincerely pray that the Supreme Court of the United States will make the just decision to overturn *Roe v. Wade* this very year.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BERGMAN), my friend and colleague.

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be here with my colleagues

who believe so fervently in doing the right thing because if you seek your wisdom from above, you will always do the right thing. I appreciate Mr. SMITH's leadership.

As we stand here remembering the 49th anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, I want to remind my colleagues that standing for life—and I repeat, standing for life—has historically been a bipartisan effort. Example, the Hyde amendment, especially across Michigan's First District.

Since coming to Congress, I am proud to have stood shoulder to shoulder with my constituents as we collectively raise our voice, and our vote, for those who have neither.

□ 1300

The very first inalienable right described in the Declaration of Independence is the right to life.

As a Member of Congress I have always and will always continue to fight to correct that right for the born and the unborn.

Protecting life isn't an issue of division. In fact, it is one of unity.

We must all work together to enact better policies and build stronger communities that create a culture of life.

Together, we can create a Nation that honors life and upholds the self-evident truth that every life is precious and must be protected.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON), a distinguished attorney before coming to Congress and number four in the line of leadership in the Republican Party.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for his principal leadership on this issue for so many years. He is a great model to us all.

Mr. Speaker, we in the Pro-Life Caucus are happy to join the March for Life tomorrow here in the Nation's capital, but we are here today to acknowledge the tragic anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*.

As has been said, more than 63 million unborn children have been denied their right to life in the past 49 years since that tragic decision was handed down.

As we fight to protect the liberties of all Americans here in Congress, we have to remember to fight first for the most defenseless, and that is the child in the womb, who from the moment of conception is a unique human being with unique DNA.

In the coming months you are going to hear a lot of vague and euphemistic language from defenders of abortion. Do not be swayed. The truth is very simple, and it has never changed. Abortion takes a baby's life, a person made in God's image.

We hope, we pray, we believe that 2022 is the year the Supreme Court will finally recognize this truth once again.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE), a medical doctor. So many of our leaders in the pro-life effort both in this Congress and legislation across the country are medical doctors and healthcare professionals.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New Jersey, Mr. SMITH, for his leadership in this incredibly important issue. Year after year he has stood for the unborn. Personally I want to thank him for that leadership.

Mr. Speaker, in the 49 years since the case of *Roe v. Wade* was ruled on by the Supreme Court, 63 million innocent unborn children have lost their lives to abortion.

Now, members of the radical left are trying to raise the number of abortions performed in the United States by repealing the Hyde amendment, which for decades has ensured that no taxpayer dollars are used to fund this barbaric procedure.

As a doctor, I swore an oath to "first, do no harm."

When I was in medical school I swore that I would never perform, assist, or support an abortion procedure. As a medical student, as an intern, as a resident, and as a board certified physician for 25 years, I lived up to that pledge.

As a legislator in the United States Congress I took a pledge to continue to stand for life.

Now is the time for Congress to pass legislation that defends the rights of the unborn.

Now is the time for us to end abortions in this country.

On this 49th anniversary of *Roe v. Wade* let us remember the lives that have been lost and recommit ourselves to defending human life.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you very much, doctor, for your leadership and eloquence.

I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BURCHETT).

Mr. BURCHETT. We can all agree that it is wrong to murder a person, Mr. Speaker, or in other words to take someone's life. So my pro-abortion colleagues need to answer the simple question of when does a little baby girl's life start?

Does it start at 6 weeks when the baby girl's heart starts beating? Most pro-abortion advocates oppose the 6-week heartbeat laws, so they would not consider a heartbeat to be life. What about when a little baby girl can start to feel pain around the halfway point in pregnancy? Not a single House Democrat cosponsored legislation that would affect babies who can feel pain, so it seems they don't believe in life at the halfway point either.

What about at 21 weeks, Mr. Speaker, when the baby girl could potentially survive outside the womb thanks to lifesaving medical technology? It seems simple to say if she could live outside the womb, she must be alive inside the womb, as well. Yet most pro-abortion advocates still say we should be able to kill her without a second thought.

Many of my pro-abortion colleagues also believe we should be able to abort viable babies even up through birth. Why should abortion doctors be allowed to kill a baby who has developed organs, a beating heart, and even the ability to recognize the sound of their own mother's voice? There is no excuse for aborting babies at birth, but the pro-abortion movement believes this murder should be allowed anyway.

It is time my pro-abortion colleagues start following the science and realize those little babies are human, alive, and worthy of life.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SMITH for the incredible work he is doing. He may not get his rewards here, but I assure you he will in Heaven.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE).

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his leadership on this issue and for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, as we approach the 49th anniversary of the Supreme Court's decision in *Roe v. Wade* my colleagues and I come together to remember the more than 63 million children who have had their lives cut short in this country since 1973.

I stand here today for the sake of the women, for the sake of the children, and for the sake of the very future of our Nation.

Because of *Roe v. Wade* and the cases that followed its precedent, the right of the unborn to be born is denied throughout our Nation more than 2,000 times every single day, and in several States throughout all 9 months of pregnancy, which *Roe* permits.

This is a great stain on this great Nation.

We will not be silent here in Congress, nor will the hundreds of millions of pro-life Americans across this country.

My colleagues and I will continue to stand for life and fight to end the tragedy that is abortion.

We will remain steadfast supporters of life and serve as voices for the voiceless and defenders of the defenseless.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his strong statement.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER.)

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for taking the lead on such an important issue.

Mr. Speaker, on the 49th anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, let's reflect on the importance of standing up for every human being's right to realize their full potential from the moment of conception.

In fact, Members of Congress have a solemn duty to defend those incapable of defending themselves, the most innocent among us, the unborn.

I will share a little bit of a personal story when my family chose life. This was when my son was 3 years old. He

was involved in an accident with a head injury, and he was on life support. And many times the doctors told us he wasn't going to survive. In fact, they said it is not an 80 percent chance, not a 95 percent chance, but it was a 100 percent chance that he was going to pass. We did not disconnect life support.

We chose life. We prayed. And Freddie started to recover.

Today Freddie is fully recovered, and though his accident was decades ago, this is an opportunity to learn about the value of human life.

Our creator has a plan for each one of us, and I will continue to support policies that ensure every life has the chance to realize its fullest potential.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for sharing that beautiful story about his son Freddie.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN), another good friend and colleague.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for all his great work on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 49th anniversary of the Supreme Court's decision in *Roe v. Wade*, a devastating decision that we have continued to remind you has killed 63 million children in this country.

Who do we trust on this issue? There it says: "In God We Trust." So if that is the case, this is what God said to Jeremiah in Jeremiah 1:5: I knew you before I formed you in the womb. So what more evidence do we need?

This shouldn't be a political debate, but now my Democratic friends are taking it one step further by attempting to abolish the Hyde amendment, which prevents taxpayer money from funding abortions. The government should not be using hard-earned taxpayer money to kill innocent children.

However, I am optimistic that the fight for life will take a step in the right direction.

The Supreme Court is currently reviewing *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*, a lawsuit challenging a Mississippi law that bans abortion after 15 weeks.

I pray that the judges will rule in favor of life.

As the father of four and the grandfather of 14, I believe that life is precious, and I will fight to protect that life.

I have taken an oath to fight for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and so has every Member of this body.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for his comments.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO).

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, you wouldn't believe it, but as I was walking here today to speak about the value of life, my daughter called me, and she is headed to the hospital to give birth to my fifth grandchildren, my second granddaughter. So isn't this

an appropriate depiction right here of my next granddaughter, who is going to be named Grace.

I used to be what they call pro-choice years ago. But I was lied to. You know, they said it was just a clump of cells, just some tissues, looked like a tadpole, nothing. But, you know, as technology has gotten better, we now have ultrasounds, and in our State of Arizona we passed legislation so that the mothers could see what their babies really look like. They have little hands, little fingers, little toes. They are humans. They are real people. They are not just a clump of cells. And that is why it is so disturbing to me that here in the U.S. Congress I don't think we have one of my Democratic colleagues left that is pro-life. I think they got rid of them in the primaries.

And when Republicans have come forward and asked the Speaker of the House, please, can we vote on a bill that requires medical help to be given to babies that are born alive in a botched abortion, she said "no." What has this country come to when we don't even want to keep a baby alive after it is born?

My fellow Republicans and I are fighting hard for the value of life to protect the preborn, to protect every life. This is the most important thing that we can do.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her remarks and wish her congratulations.

I yield to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ROSENDALE).

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for being a leading example on this charge for us.

Tomorrow will be a unique and significant day. Tomorrow many of us will take the unfortunately similar steps of a march that began in 1974. This March for Life however may be the last one before the stain of *Roe v. Wade* is lifted from this Nation.

However, even if we are so fortunate, the decision to continue this crime will likely remain in many of the States.

Sadly, millions of Americans have yet to awaken, awaken to the cruelty and the evil that is abortion. The reason for this slumber is no less devastating than the murder of 63 million children. It is the failure to recognize the inherent dignity of every life. This failure has justified the intentional killing of a living child, led to the many atrocities of the 21st century and this American tragedy. We, however, are not reconciled to continue this moral failing.

I often think about the abortionist who has woken up to the evil which he has been so complicit in. That moment when his heart converts, when he has been availed of the truth inherent in human life. He looks back at the trail of broken bodies that he has traveled.

But if we stop there at the horror and the tragedy, we would not have hope because we know that when he looks up he now sees those glorified souls

looking down on him, singing in praise and rejoicing in his conversion.

□ 1315

There is renewal in our movement, and there is hope. There is the hopeful anticipation that everyone in every State will also see the obvious truth and the inherent beauty in the tiniest life.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for including me in this Special Order today.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments and leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT), a good friend and colleague.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I may have a slightly different tone here. I was born in an unwed mother's home in downtown L.A., and so were all my siblings. In my late thirties, I got an email out of nowhere, and it said: Hi, David. I am a friend of your sister's. Here is your information. Here is your birth mother.

We had a family discussion. I sent a very carefully worded note, and a couple of weeks later, I got this phone call, this tiny voice crying—and I am crying now also on the phone. And she is saying: I go to mass almost every day. On your birthday, I am terrified. Are you having a good life? How has your world been?

And I am crying on the other side, basically saying: Look, I have had a great life. I got adopted by a family that brought me to Arizona. I get to live in the Phoenix area. I have a wonderful brother and sister, who were also born in the unwed mother's home.

It became an amazing experience. My mom, who is right here, and this is my birth mom right here, they became best of friends. I have never told this part of the story here, but my birth mom—both of them have now passed away—had an early type of Alzheimer's, a type of dementia. But my mom here had sent her all sorts of photos of me being a child. So when you go into the house that they had there in California, there would be my two 6' tall blonde half sisters and then pictures of me as a baby growing up.

In her mind, I was always there. I was always part of the family. The dear Lord does heal.

But one of her best friends at the funeral turned to me and said: David, did Mary Lynn ever tell you the story of when we were in the car on the way to Tijuana to go get an abortion?

As they got closer and closer to the border, she began to cry. Then they got closer, and she started to hyperventilate. Eventually, she became so crushed with fear and sadness and terror, the girls turned around and went back and talked to her mother. A few months later, I was born at that Holy Family Unwed Mothers Home.

Now I am this age, and I have an adopted little girl, who is the third generation adopted in our family.

For those of us who passionately care about life, I think it is important we also tell the stories of how grateful some of us are to be alive; the amazing life my little girl is having and how grateful I am to her birth mom for giving us the greatest gift my wife and I have ever had; and understanding that the ultimate definition of love is life. Maybe others out there can have the amazing experience I have had with meeting my birth family and my family and my siblings' birth families. It is just one amazing experience of joy of life.

That needs to be what, I think, we focus on. There is good here if we just change our hearts and our minds.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman so much for sharing that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER), my good friend and colleague.

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from New Jersey. It is an honor to join my colleagues here during this special week.

Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago, I approached the podium for the first time to give my speech on the House floor. I chose my topic intentionally as it is an issue that I will always champion: protecting the lives of the unborn. There is no effort more worthy than supporting life. This issue defines our culture, our society, and our value system.

Every year, I am overwhelmed at the outpouring of effort, energy, and support that floods this cause. So thank you, and thank you to my colleagues in the House and Senate who join me in this fight. Thank you to the health practitioners working nonstop to provide resources to help new mothers choose life. Thanks to our advocates on the ground, from the airwaves to in-person, for continually showing your support. And thank you to our pastors and religious organizations for seeking divine guidance and strength in this effort.

I am inspired by you all and will keep doing everything I can to continue this fight to protect the unborn.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), and I thank him for his leadership on his pending bill.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from New Jersey for his years of unending work for the unborn. He has been so steadfast that, from the bottom of my heart, I thank him for all he has done.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because the tragedy of abortion is the greatest human rights issue of our day. The right to life is the foundation upon which all other rights are built. The science is clear: Abortion ends a human life.

Studies have proven chemical abortion puts the life of the mother in great danger. In 2015, one in three

women who took the abortion drug ended up in the emergency room within 30 days. Let me repeat that. One in three women who took the abortion drug ended up in the emergency room within 30 days.

Congress must do more to provide women and their unborn children with care and support. I am proud that my legislation, the SAVE Moms and Babies Act, would prevent the FDA from approving new abortion drugs and would stop these dangerous pills from being dispensed through telemedicine.

I would like to thank everyone in Washington, D.C., this week who is offering their unwavering dedication to defending the unborn despite a culture that often marginalizes pro-life values.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO), my friend and colleague and leader in the pro-life movement as well.

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for putting on this very, very Special Order so we can address a very serious issue that is plaguing our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the anniversary of Roe v. Wade, a standard of unparalleled violence against an innocent population in this country. The biggest casualty caused by Roe v. Wade are the 62 million children killed before they had a chance.

Our forefathers believed that every man, woman, and child has a God-given right to life. Our Constitution makes no caveat for only those who can walk, talk, and speak.

Because of my children and my faith, protecting life is a very personal responsibility to me. As a Catholic, I can testify how faith encourages strength of character, urges truthfulness, and prioritizes the sanctity of life.

The sad truth is that you will find many of the politicians claiming to be religious actively rejecting each of these faith-founded principles. The most basic way to exercise faith is by adhering to the Ten Commandments, including thou shalt not kill.

I appreciate all of my friends and colleagues in Congress who are standing up and speaking up for those who cannot today. I am grateful to know that there are Americans who will speak and fight alongside me on behalf of millions of unborn babies who cannot defend themselves.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have always felt the 1960s was where America went off the rails. Of course, Roe v. Wade wasn't decided in exactly the 1960s, but the 1960s really, I think, began with the assassination of President Kennedy. You would say the end of that disastrous

decade was January 22, 1973, where the Supreme Court decided that abortion was legal in the United States of America. Just a disaster.

Since then, 63 million unborn children have died in every State. Ten years before that, abortion would have been considered illegal. All churches would have been appalled by it, and all Americans knew it was just a horrible thing. But then, in an example of out-of-control judiciary, probably the most extreme example in our country, the U.S. Supreme Court came in and began a reign in which 63 million unborn children have lost their lives.

The U.S. is one of seven countries where late-term abortions are illegal. We stand with Vietnam, North Korea, Red China, together with Singapore, Canada, and the Netherlands. We are one of the few countries in the world, after all God has given us, that we decide to step up and say it is appropriate to kill a child right up to birth.

In any event, today, we mourn the anniversary of Roe v. Wade. We look forward to leaving this Chamber and marching in the March for Life, as we hope that this is finally—given that there is an important Supreme Court decision coming down—finally the end, or the beginning of the end, of this ongoing slaughter of the innocent in the United States.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for reminding us that the Chinese Communist Party and North Korea both have policies like ours, especially as it relates to up-to-birth abortions.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for being a stalwart leader on this ever since I have been involved in this. I appreciate him for being courageous and strong on defending life.

Mr. Speaker, as we know, in the 49 years since the Supreme Court codified Roe v. Wade, the science behind pregnancy and its diagnosis, so to speak, has advanced exponentially. We know this year the Supreme Court will rule on a case called Dobbs v. Jackson to decide on limiting abortion access to 15 weeks of pregnancy.

As if there has been any doubt, really, of what a pregnancy means commonsense-wise, that it is a child developing—not a blob, a tissue mass, a clump of cells, or a baby giraffe. No, it is a human being.

Medical advancements like ultrasounds since that decision 49 years ago, prenatal surgeries, all these have shown the humanity of the unborn, which points to the value of life from the moment of conception, from that flash of light.

By 15 weeks in the womb, babies have fully developed hearts, can taste, can make facial expressions, and can feel pain. With today's medical advancements, a baby can survive outside the womb, incredibly, at 22 weeks and, in

some cases, even earlier with aggressive care and maybe a little bit of luck and God's blessing.

Roe v. Wade allows a baby to be born as late as 28 weeks. At 28 weeks, a baby is a living, breathing, developed person with thoughts and a future. We need revisions to Roe v. Wade. The future of our Nation, its morality, its outlook, it depends on it. Abortion is a gruesome act that destroys families, harms women's health, mentally and physically, and takes the life of the innocent.

I will always fight for the unborn, the sanctity of life, and our traditional family values this country is founded upon. It is truly a cornerstone, and it is abhorrent that lives like this can be taken needlessly when we have so many remedies.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership all these many years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. VAN DUYNE).

Ms. VAN DUYNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this weekend, tens of thousands of men and women will fill the streets of our Capital to march for the lives of the unborn and to advocate for the rights of the most vulnerable Americans.

These men and women are advocating for an end to abortion, but they are not just seeking policy solutions. I know many of the devoted participants in the March for Life and about all the work they do in our communities to make sure that no woman ever feels alone or that abortion is her only option.

□ 1330

They staff pregnancy centers, host diaper drives, provide information on adoptions, and organize childcare for young mothers. They are doing the work of making their cities and neighborhoods a place where no one is alone and there is a support system for every mother. There is sensitive and compassionate help available to those facing an unwanted pregnancy.

Mr. Speaker, as we march for life this weekend, we march for a greater future for all of us, one that values the unborn and sees the potential in every life. I am proud to support, champion, and stand with these efforts.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I now yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. HARSHBARGER), who is also a pharmacist.

Mrs. HARSHBARGER. Mr. Speaker, my belief in God and my Christian faith, they are the catalyst for every decision I make. Remarkable Americans from across the country are gathering this week in Washington, D.C., to advocate for the protection of unborn children.

Written into the Declaration of Independence is our founding faith and principle that we are all created by God, created equally, endowed by our creator with the unalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happi-

ness. However, since the infamous Supreme Court decision of Roe v. Wade some 49 years ago, we have fallen short of that national edict by not acknowledging that life at every stage is precious, valuable, sacred, and should be protected.

To the many Americans marching in person this week and supporting the pro-life movement through other means, I want to say thank you for your dedication to this most worthy cause and know that you are not alone in this fight. As you continue to stand up for those who cannot stand up for themselves, remember that my pro-life colleagues and I stand with you.

Mr. Speaker, I promise to use this platform right here in Congress and beyond to continue my vocal and unapologetic advocacy for unborn children. I will not stop fighting until our laws and policies protect life at every stage. I hope you won't either.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT), a friend and colleague for several decades.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize my colleagues this solemn day. It is the day we commemorate the anniversary of Roe v. Wade. I have said it before and continue to say, as I have many times, I am pro-life. I am pro-family. I am pro-child. I join my colleagues and constituents in Alabama's Fourth Congressional District in remembering the, literally, millions of babies that have been aborted since that 1973 decision.

Mr. Speaker, this year we are possibly on the brink of a transformational moment in our history, a moment of hope that we really haven't had for many, many years, the reversal of or major changes to Roe v. Wade.

As most of us know, in June of this year we expect the U.S. Supreme Court to hand down a decision on the Dobbs v. Jackson case. In deciding this case, the Supreme Court has the opportunity to protect the lives of unborn children after the 15-week mark of pregnancy.

Mr. Speaker, I think we all have to be clear. Even if the Supreme Court upholds the Mississippi law as it is written, abortion will not be banned nationwide. It simply gives the power back to the States. For me, my pro-life stance is deeply rooted in my Christian faith. Just as important, my opposition to abortion is about doing what is right. It is about protecting unborn babies. It is about not trying to impose my faith on anyone else.

Mr. Speaker, that is because it is also rooted in science. Like much of science, our scope of knowledge on the development of unborn babies has advanced farther than what we knew back in 1973. It is time for our laws to catch up.

At 15 weeks, an unborn baby has a heartbeat. It can open and close its fingers and hands. It can taste. It can even feel pain. No argument in favor of abortion can overcome one unchanging fact, and that is abortion stops a beating heart.

Given developments of unborn babies at 15 weeks, abortions after this timeframe often involve gruesome medical procedures that are dangerous for mothers and undoubtedly painful to the baby.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues, as we look forward, as we return back to our States, and as this issue is hopefully turned over into the hands of the States, we can make groundbreaking steps in saving the lives of the unborn.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I now yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MANN).

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my reasoning for voting to protect unborn American citizens. I believe that life begins at conception which is why I support adoptions, foster care, and crisis pregnancy centers that work tirelessly to care for mothers and babies.

Kansans are leading the way in protecting the right to life by placing the Value Them Both amendment on the ballot, this year's response to the Kansas Supreme Court's unthinkable ruling that abortion is a constitutional right. For my part, I have cosponsored pro-life legislation including H.R. 18, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, permanently prohibiting Federal funding for abortions and abortion services. I have introduced my own H.R. 714 which would require the executive branch to notify Congress and the American public before issuing any new executive order pertaining to pro-life provisions.

Mr. Speaker, abortion has desensitized our Nation. I pray we wake up soon and repent for the horrors we have visited upon America's most vulnerable, the unborn. Imagine what this country would look like economically, culturally, socially, and spiritually if abortion hadn't wiped out an entire generation of Americans, 63.4 million people over the last 50 years.

Mr. Speaker, I say thank you to all of you who have joined together in this fight. Thank you for using your voices to defend the voiceless.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I now recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON). As I said before, there are doctors who are outspoken in their defense of life, Dr. Thompson is one of those.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today during this Special Order to reaffirm my commitment to protect and defend the sanctity of life.

From the moment I stepped foot into this Chamber in 2009, I submitted my promise to protect our most vulnerable, the unborn. In this Congress I have cosponsored 11 bills and signed on to eight letters relating to pro-life policies.

Our Founders enshrined in the Declaration of Independence three unalienable rights. The first is the right to life. Sadly, from the moment of the Roe v. Wade decision, the basic

right to life has been denied to more than 60 million unborn children. We don't know what those children would have grown up to do. Perhaps they would have cured cancer, found a solution to Alzheimer's. The possibilities are endless with the loss of those lives.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today with so many of my colleagues. We know that there is hope on the horizon. The life movement is strong, and I look forward to continuing to advocate on behalf of pro-life policies. It is my hope that one day those unalienable rights will extend to all Americans born and unborn. It is my prayer that this will be the last march for life with *Roe v. Wade* being the law of the land. When we march next year, it will be in celebration for what we have accomplished for the protection of the unborn.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD), a good friend and colleague.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in defense of life.

This Saturday, as many of the previous speakers had alluded to, is the 49th anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*. As such, it is a fitting time to talk about this administration's radical anti-life policies for which some of us were caught off guard when President Biden was running for the Presidency.

Over the past year we have watched President Biden and the Democrats continually push what I would consider an anti-life full agenda. First, they gutted the Hyde amendment, a long-standing provision of appropriations bills that prevents taxpayer funding for abortions and has saved an estimated 2 million lives.

Then the Biden Administration's Department of Health and Human Services changed the rules to essentially require healthcare providers to perform abortions, despite any moral objections they may have.

Finally, my Democrat colleagues passed a radical bill that removes existing limits on abortion and allows abortions on demand, no matter the age of the fetus.

Mr. Speaker, I will always push back on their anti-life stances with a clear and strong message of full opposition. I believe that every human life is precious and should be protected at every stage. Throughout my career, I have always stood for life. I will continue to fight against this administration's anti-life policies.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today, after decades of noble struggle and sacrifice, pro-life Americans are hopeful that government-sanctioned violence against children and the exploitation of women by abortion may be nearing an end, although in a very real way the struggle to defend innocent human life now enters a critically important new phase.

Because of the *Dobbs* case, because the Supreme Court has finally seemingly accepted a relook at *Roe v. Wade* and subsequent decisions, the Federal

Government and the States-based suit have new authority to protect the weakest and the most vulnerable among us. Protection for unborn children is at a tipping point. In 2022, the Supreme Court can begin dismantling the culture of death that it has imposed on America.

Mr. Speaker, for decades and right up to this very moment, abortion supporters have gone through extraordinary lengths to ignore, to trivialize, and to cover up the battered baby victim. With stolid resolve, they defend the indefensible.

Why does dismembering a child with sharp knives, pulverizing a child with powerful suction devices, chemically poisoning a baby with any number of toxic chemicals—one method euphemistically called medical abortion—why does all of this fail to elicit so much as a scintilla of empathy, mercy, or compassion from the so-called pro-choice crowd?

Have the physical and emotional consequences of women been underreported? You bet they have. I have been in the pro-life movement for almost 50 years. Both my wife, Marie, and I do work with a lot of women who have had abortions. They tell us stories of agony that, just like the fact of the unborn child's worth and dignity, has been trivialized by the other side of this issue.

Mr. Speaker, why are children born alive during some late-term abortions not given the same standard of care and respect as premature infants born at that very same age? They are left to die, or they are just killed after they are born.

President Biden understands the gruesome reality of abortion and this injustice. At least he once did. As Senator Biden wrote to constituents in explaining his support for the Hyde amendment, for example, prohibiting taxpayer funding for elective abortions, he said it would protect both the woman and her unborn child. He stated at the time he had consistently, on no fewer than 50 occasions, voted against Federal funding of abortions. Further, those of us who are opposed to abortion should not be compelled to pay for them.

Today, the President has weaponized the entire Federal bureaucracy to aggressively promote abortion on demand at home and overseas, including full court press to force taxpayers to fund abortions on demand including the repeal of the Hyde amendment.

Last September, the House passed a bill, the abortion on demand until birth act. Of course, it had a different name that just cloaked the misery that it would impose. That bill would not only codify late-term abortions, it would also nullify nearly every modest pro-life restriction ever enacted by the States including a woman's right to know laws in 35 states, parental involvement statutes in 37 states, pain-capable unborn child protection laws in 19 states, sex-selection abortion bans in

almost a dozen states and waiting periods in 26 states. By his words and his deeds, the President has become the abortion President. I think he wants to own that.

Mr. Speaker, this all comes at a time when ultrasound imaging has made unborn babies more visible, with a greater clarity than ever before. Breakthrough research has now found that unborn children can feel pain at a gestational age of 15 weeks and maybe earlier.

□ 1345

Today modern medicine treats an ever-increasing number of unborn children with disability and disease as patients in need of diagnosis and life-enhancing treatments before birth. Unborn babies are society's youngest patients and deserve protection, not death by abortion. Science informs us that birth is merely an event—albeit a very important one—in the life of the child. It is not the beginning of his or her life.

As most people know, after the ultrasound the grandparents, the parents, and the friends get pictures of the child in utero. The ultrasound pictures are the first baby pictures that are now plastered on all of our refrigerators in great expectation for that event called birth.

The right to life is the first human right, and it must be guaranteed to everyone regardless of race, age, sex, disability, stage of development, or condition of dependency. Life is not just for the planned, the privileged, or the perfect.

We need to protect these innocent children.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LET'S HAVE A DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleagues who have been down here on the floor of the House of Representatives for the most part of the last hour talking about the importance of defending life, those infamous—or famous or important words, I should say, in the Declaration of Independence: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Nothing can be more important than this body focusing on defending life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and my colleagues' focus on life, as we sit here now 49 years removed from a Supreme Court decision taking out of the hands of the people and putting it into the hands of unelected judges' decisions, about the beginning of life, when life begins, the important reality of a people defending life.

What is controversial about defending life?

It is a question for this body.

What is controversial about defending life when we talk about life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness and when we talk about living on this Earth while God gives us the precious time we have here?

What are we going to do with that time?

Are we going to live free?

Are we going to be able to pursue happiness?

Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness: one might wonder here now 1 year into the current administration, the Biden administration, whether the average American would say that he or she is free to pursue happiness.

Are we free?

Are we free to pursue happiness when, in fact, just a few miles away—and, frankly, a few thousand feet—from this Chamber where we are right now, restaurants are being chastised and pursued by the Government of the District of Columbia representing this area that forms our Nation's Capitol because those restaurants may not believe that it is in their interest or the interest of the people whom they serve to be checking papers and to be checking so-called vaccine passports or vaccine passes?

One restaurant in particular over on H Street—which was one of the early restaurants on H Street as it was revitalizing—has been fined, berated, and harassed by the Government of the District of Columbia for wanting its doors to be open and not wanting to harass its patrons. They want them to use their own free will to make a decision about what is in their interest. They don't want to live in a republic where you are forced to show papers to walk about and to engage in society, to freely move about and engage in commerce.

The very heart of the kinds of ideas that the Founders meant and what Jefferson meant when he penned pursuit of happiness is that we not allow a government through tyrannical policies to interfere with our pursuit of happiness: our ability to go have a business, our ability to go out and take care of our family, our ability to move about and to engage in commerce, our ability to create wealth and opportunity for our children and our grandchildren, to be able to get healthcare, and to be able to be secure in our possessions, secure in our belongings, and secure in our own homes.

I would ask this question: Is the United States more secure than it was 1 year ago?

Is the United States stronger economically than it was 1 year ago?

Is the United States stronger on the world stage?

Are we safer from our enemies than we were 1 year ago?

Is our border secure?

Are we able to afford energy and have reliable energy to heat our homes, fuel our cars, provide jobs, and keep us warm in the winter and cool in the summer?

Are we able to do that better more than 1 year ago?

The answer very clearly to all of those questions is a resounding “no.”

Do you think it is an accident that I just spent 2 hours in a hearing in the Judiciary Committee bemoaning the United States Senate for holding the line on the filibuster which Democrats and this President wanted to throw over the wall in the name of voting rights because nobody can oppose something called voting rights?

They put up those words, they call it the Voting Rights Act, and they name it after people we serve with in the Chamber to provide maximum guilt if you dare stand up and say, Mr. Speaker, that the people in the States ought to be able to decide how to ensure that the elections of the people who represent them are secure; that you dare to have a voter ID favored by 80 percent of the American people.

But yet let's go back to what I just said: I have to have an ID just to walk in and buy a hamburger in the Nation's Capitol, but I cannot have an ID to vote. No. No. No. That is Jim Crow 2.0 I am told by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

I actually had colleagues on the committee today walking through the horrors of the poll tax—the jelly bean counting and all of the obstructions put into place for voting in the 1950s and 1960s that the Voting Rights Act nobly pursued to correct—and then tried to compare that to voter identification.

They tried to compare that to wanting to make sure that mail-in ballots aren't abused by anybody in any party, even though, by the way, those bastions of crazy conservatism, Jimmy Carter and James Baker, came out in a report over a decade ago that The New York Times quoted saying precisely that mail-in ballots are the area where you have the most fraud.

Now, all of us want to have integrity and belief in our elections. But our Democratic colleagues want to use that issue to divide us, as President Biden literally admitted yesterday. In his 1-hour marathon wandering, meandering press conference, he literally said that he could not say whether the elections will be legitimate this fall unless—unless—we embrace the legislation that he says must get passed and that we must set aside the traditions of the Senate to jam it through. And all of it, very clearly, is to set the stage for a lack of faith and belief in the elections that are coming this November.

Again I ask: Is America stronger or weaker?

Is it richer or poorer? More secure or less safe?

We know the answer, and that is why my colleagues on the other side of the aisle wish not to talk about those issues. We don't want to have a debate about crime on the floor.

Do any of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to come down to

the floor right now and have a debate about crime in the United States?

Do they?

Do you think a 50 percent increase in crime in Austin, a 50 percent increase in crime in San Antonio, a 19-year-old woman shot in a Burger King in New York City, a 24-year-old student murdered walking the streets of Los Angeles, train robberies in 21st century America with litter all over the tracks in Los Angeles, is an accident?

Or could it be that radical leftists who are funded to take over the district attorneys' offices in cities across America and radical city councils like the Austin City Council and leftists in this Chamber believe that letting criminals out on the streets and believe in not prosecuting people is going to make our country safer?

It is empirically and obviously untrue.

The American people see it. And I promise you, Mr. Speaker, take this bet: We will not have a debate on the floor of this body about crime while I am here this year. It will not happen. My Democratic colleagues would not dare have a debate about crime because they would get absolutely decimated.

They sure as heck do not want to have a debate about the border.

Do you want to talk about 2 million apprehensions?

Do you want to talk about 1 million people released?

Do you want to talk about dead Texans?

Do you want to talk about fentanyl pouring into our communities, 100,000 dead Americans, opioid poisonings of our youth, and kids taking Xanax and dying because cartels are flooding into our country while China drives them right up through Mexico?

Not a person in this Chamber on the other side of the aisle wants to come to the floor and have an adult debate about why our country is much less secure and much more endangered at the hands of the cartels and of people making money trafficking in human beings and undermining our security and safety in the United States of America.

I promise you, Mr. Speaker, Joe Biden and the NANCY PELOSI Democrats have no interest in having a debate about the border because it is an embarrassment and it is a travesty.

Ranches are getting overrun, people are dying, bullets are being fired across at our own Border Patrol, the National Guard is having to fire at cars coming across the border, livestock is getting out, bodies are stacking up in body trailers in Brooks County, Texas, and cartels are making hundreds of millions of dollars on a daily basis driving fentanyl into our kids' communities and schools.

No, no, no. We do not want to have a debate about the state of our border.

Do we want to have a debate about the state of healthcare mandates?

No. No. This body has no debate but embraces rules. We must wear masks, they say. For a year and a half we have

been excoriated—even fined—if you don't wear a mask the floor of the House of Representatives—masks which are very clearly proven—fabric masks—to have no real discernible benefit over the last year and a half of the mandates that say you must wear a face covering.

They said: Well, are we going to mandate N95s?

Are we going to have to wear N95s on the floor?

Do they want to talk about the negative effects in the study that wearing N95s for a prolonged period of time, what that does for people's health and well-being, breathing carbon dioxide, minimizing your cognitive ability if you wear N95s for a long time?

Some people might joke: Would it make any difference on the floor of the House if you minimized the cognitive ability of the Members of the House? You could argue that it may not make any difference whatsoever. I am looking in the mirror myself.

We do not want to have a debate on the floor of the House on anything, by the way, much less the reality of what has been happening with respect to this virus and our response to it; and what Anthony Fauci engaged in with respect to the reality of the truth of funding gain-of-function research knowing full well the dangers, working to cover that up and hide from the American people how this virus came about; not wanting to pursue the truth on that, not wanting to pursue the truth or conduct studies on natural immunity.

We have study after study after study coming out right now. I could pull out on my phone and pull up study after study now finally demonstrating and showing how natural immunity is more powerful than vaccinations, and people don't want to be able to have that honest conversation.

□ 1400

An adult leadership would have done like the Nation of Japan saying: We believe that vaccines are effective for a large group of people. We believe that there are some risks. You are adults. We won't mandate. You decide.

We can't do that in the supposed land of the free? We sit up here and we stare at that American flag and we talk about the Senate being the greatest deliberative body. They don't really debate. This being the people's House, the people's Chamber, when was the last time the Speaker heard a robust debate on the floor of the House with multiple Members?

When was the last time we offered an amendment on the floor of the House in open debate that wasn't predetermined by all of the Rules Committee overlords who govern our lives? Democrat and Republican, I do want to say.

Mr. Speaker, it has been 6 years since we have had an amendment offered on the floor of the House in open debate. Do you want to know why we can't do anything in this Chamber? Because we don't ever debate. We don't ever actu-

ally have a discussion, throw things out there and then vote. Maybe, just maybe, we come to some bipartisan agreement.

I am happy to work with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. DEAN PHILLIPS and I worked on the PPP Flexibility Act. ABIGAIL SPANBERGER and I have introduced legislation called the TRUST Act to deal with stock trading believing that might help improve people's faith and confidence in this body. I have introduced numerous bills and passed numerous bills with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. That is not what this is about.

It is about a broken body refusing to actually debate, refusing to actually engage, refusing to offer amendments. Both sides do it. That needs to end.

The last point that I will make on that point, if you want this body to function again, you have to stop spending money we don't have. If you keep writing blank checks, how on Earth is there a check against the wisdom of the policy? You just keep writing a check to keep doing the same thing or to do something different. You can't run a business that way. You can't run a home that way. You can't run a church that way. You can't run a legitimate school that way. But no, no, we just keep writing checks to fund the expansion of government, to fund the creation of programs no matter who is in power.

Over the last year, we have seen what that causes when it is then left in the hands of an administration that literally does not care about the rule of law.

To be very clear, this administration is ignoring the rule of law, ignoring their oath, ignoring their duty to enforce the laws of the United States, ignoring their duty to secure the border, ignoring their duty to stand up in defense of the men and women in blue, to follow the laws around the United States, ignoring their oath to stand up and defend the United States against our foreign enemies; hold the line against Russia; push back on Russia; sanction them; hold the line on Nord Stream 2; stand alongside Ukraine; push back on China; stop appeasing them.

Don't leave \$85 billion sitting there in the hands of terrorists when we walk away and abandon our duty and leave those men and women in the field, and then have 13 dead marines to show for it.

That is the legacy of the first year of this administration. But will President Biden, when he strolls to that podium on March 1 for his so-called State of the Union, and we are all spread out, and all wearing masks, and doing whatever the heck we are going to do—not actually doing the people's business—will he address any of those issues?

Will he talk about border security? Will he talk about how we are weaker around the world? Will he talk about the crime on the streets of Los Ange-

les, New York, Austin, San Antonio, and Chicago?

Will he talk about the businesses getting crippled by mask mandates and health mandates?

Will he talk about the children who are now having mental health issues, the people who are sick; the diseases that weren't dealt with, all to push a vaccine mandate that goes contrary to the pursuit of happiness and our right as Americans to live free?

Will he talk about any of those things? Will he talk about the fact that the United States of America is sitting on one of the world's largest reservoirs of energy and, yet, we are wondering even in Texas whether you can have the lights on because we built no nuclear power plants.

We slowed down our production of clean burning natural gas, all chasing unicorn energy policies of wind and solar as if they can possibly, possibly power the world at the level that is needed for the proper amount of human flourishing while 3 billion people around this planet do not have access to abundant energy and power.

Will the President of the United States come down here and talk about that or will he get up there and just talk about: Well, we are going to be net zero in our carbon production by 2035, or 2050, or make up some totally arbitrary number without regard at all to what that does to the price of energy and the availability and abundance of energy.

All of this has real-life consequences for Americans. People die. Houses get cold. People can't get access to energy. They can't afford energy. They lose jobs. You have stagnation and then you have the brilliance of this administration and the brilliance of those in the media starting to talk about energy and food price control because, of course, that is what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will resort to.

They will sit there and bemoan markets when they don't let the markets work. Healthcare markets never work. We haven't had a healthcare market in decades. It is an absolute lie; and I am looking at you Big Healthcare. I am looking at you Big Pharma. I am looking at you hospitals. I am looking at you Big Insurance. You made out like bandits after ObamaCare. You minted money. And probably three-quarters of the people in this Chamber fattened their wallets and their portfolios riding the back of all of that Big Healthcare enrichment, all at the expense of poor Americans around this country trying to get access to a doctor without having to call some bureaucrat in the government, the VA, or an insurance company, or however it may be, but it sure as heck isn't their doctor.

We don't have health freedom in this country. We have mandated Big Healthcare, Big Government, Big Insurance, bureaucracy. And everybody knows it. Everybody knows it because you all had to deal with it. You have

had to call somebody. You had to call some kid sitting in Omaha in some phone bank telling you which doctor you can go to 2,000 miles away. That is the truth, and we all know it. We sit in here, we roll in here and we say: Let's spend more money and create a government program. Let's spend more money we don't have.

Not one person in this body will come down here and truly debate any of these truths when you are \$30 trillion in debt; when you are funding the very FBI going after parents for daring to stand up and defend their children in a school board meeting; when you are funding the Department of Homeland Security that is literally lying to the American people saying our border is secure while hundreds of thousands of people come across.

You want to know what happened in that synagogue? Because we don't have a dang clue who is coming to the United States, and this administration doesn't care. They don't care. They don't care what list they are on. They don't care whether they pose a danger to the United States of America. They don't care at all who is coming into this country. And they sure as heck don't care what is happening to the people of Texas, Arizona, or, frankly, everybody around this country who is having to bear the cost, who is having to bear the burden of what wide-open borders means to the United States of America.

Complain about Mayorkas? We should impeach him for failing to faithfully execute the laws of the United States of America, endangering Americans in the process, ignoring the laws of the United States. And that is what is happening. That is what is happening.

America is poorer, sicker, and less safe a year into the Biden administration, and that is the truth. Our enemies know it. That is why Russia is going after Ukraine. That is why China is rattling on a daily basis. That is why Russia, China, and Iran are talking about joint exercises. That is why the cartels are emboldened. That is why there are people marching through Mexico from all over the world coming to our southern border. That is why there are people on the streets breaking into businesses, assaulting people on the streets and killing them, raping them. It is happening every single day in the United States of America with reckless abandon while Democrats in district attorney's offices, Democrats in the House of Representatives, Democrats in this administration do nothing about it and do not care that the American people are left holding the bag.

Then they want to talk about taking away our Second Amendment rights and our ability to defend ourselves. Well, that crap ain't going to happen because we are going to defend ourselves in the land of the free. We are going to stand up and defend our communities and defend our families. We are going to stand up in defense of the

Constitution and limited government and freedom to be able to protect our families and protect our States when this administration is letting this country burn.

It dares to do an hour-long press conference, lecturing the people for wanting to make sure their elections are secure, for daring to say that we should have voter identification when that same administration is ordering vaccine mandates that are causing healthcare workers to lose their jobs; causing healthcare workers in long-term health facilities to be unable to carry out their jobs.

And then there is the talk about, oh, the burden on hospitals. Well, you just caused 20 percent of nurses to have to leave because you were mandating they take a jab for something that is a year old that Pfizer is making billions of dollars on. Then we won't even have a hearing about why on Earth we are having this virus in the first place, because of what Anthony Fauci knew and what NIH was up to and what China was up to.

We won't have a hearing about natural immunity. We won't have a hearing about the dangers and levels of dangers of the vaccines, what they may be. Again, my polio-stricken father who is 79 has been vaccinated. I refuse to say whether I have been vaccinated. I think it is a principle for Americans that they shouldn't have to say.

My point is, there are people for whom the vaccine makes sense. There are people for whom the vaccine does not make sense. Mandating a jab in a 5-year-old is irresponsible and it is dangerous. We should have that conversation instead of blindly walking around preaching what other people should stick in their dang arm.

But that is what we do in the people's House. I am sitting here in an empty Chamber—with the Speaker, respectfully—and that is it. They are all jet-fumed out, leaving town. Oh, we shut down earlier. Let's get out of here. Or they are out at some fundraiser or something.

Let's have a debate on these issues. Let's seek the truth. I don't know all of the truth on all of those issues. I don't know the specific risks. I have read a lot about what is going on with the vaccines, positive and negative. But it is becoming very, very clear that it doesn't do squat to stop the spread. So you are left basically saying: Well, it is better for you so that you don't die in the hospital.

Well, let's look at the data on that. But why don't we just present the information and let the American people decide? Japan's vaccine rate is a lot higher than ours and ours has mandates. All they did was say: We think it is good. There are some risks. You decide. We can't do that in America?

We can't just go down to the border and say: You know what, it is better for migrants, better for Texans and all Americans, bad for cartels, bad for China, if we secure our border. That is

the truth. Talk to the migrants getting abused. Talk to the people in south Texas. Go to Laredo and Webb County. Sit down with the Brown people in Laredo who will say: We are pretty ticked off with this administration about how they are handling the border.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle might be up for a rude awakening pretty soon about their expectations of what voters are voting for them and what voters are not because there are a lot of people in this country that are sick and tired of the elite in this town, immersed in the swamp, promoting Big Healthcare, promoting Big Tech, promoting Big Government, minimizing the rights and the abilities of Americans to live their lives the way they see fit.

That is our calling as we head to 2026, our 250th birthday of the United States of America, which comes up in 4-and-a-half years. Will we be able to say that we live in the land of the free? Will we be able to say that we are pursuing happiness; that we are the country of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness?

We will only be able to do that if we stand up and secure our Nation's sovereignty, defend our streets, protect our families, stand up to enemies around the world, and limit this body to the job that it was given in the Constitution: limit our spending to the dollars that we have and responsibly lead this country and represent the people so that this country can, in fact, be great in our agreements and our disagreements in a Federalist Republic where we are able to live free.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 452.—An act to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Willie O'Ree, in recognition of his extraordinary contributions and commitment to hockey, inclusion, and recreational opportunity.

S. 2959.—An act to provide that, due to the disruptions caused by COVID-19, applications for impact aid funding for fiscal year 2023 may use certain data submitted in the fiscal year 2022 application.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 21, 2022, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-3223. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; North Carolina: Mecklenburg General Provisions [EPA-R04-OAR-2020-0705; FRL-9235-02-R4] received January 12, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-3224. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; North Carolina: Minor Revisions to Cotton Ginning Operations Rule [EPA-R04-OAR-2021-0430; FRL-9060-02-R4] received January 12, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-3225. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — State of New Mexico Underground Injection Control Program; Primacy Revisions [EPA-HQ-OW-2020-0154; FRL-7998-02-OW] received January 12, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-3226. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Clean Air Act Section 112 List of Hazardous Air Pollutants: Amendments to the List of Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAP) [EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0471; FRL-5562-08-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS26) received January 12, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-3227. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final action — Findings of Failure to Submit State Implementation Plan Revisions in Response to the 2015 Findings of Substantial Inadequacy and SIP Calls to Amend Provisions Applying to Excess Emissions During Periods of Startup, Shutdown, and Malfunction [EPA-HQ-OAR-2021-0862; FRL-9250-01-OAR] received January 12, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-3228. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Trifloxystrobin; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2020-0038; FRL-9086-01-OCSP] received January 12, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-3229. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Limited Approval and Limited Disapproval of California Air Quality Implementation Plan Revisions; Amador Air District; Stationary Source Permits [EPA-R09-OAR-2021-0438; FRL-8773-02-R9] received January 12, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-3230. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Wisconsin; Redesignation of the Rhinelander Sulfur Dioxide Nonattainment Area [EPA-R05-OAR-2021-0540; FRL-9201-02-R5] received January 12, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-3231. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 21-033, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 40(g)(2) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3232. A letter from the Director, Office of Financial Reporting and Policy, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's FY 2021 Agency Financial Report, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a)(1); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-289, Sec. 2(a)); (116 Stat. 2049); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-3233. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Civil Monetary Penalty Inflation Adjustment [FRL-5906.6-01-OECA] received January 12, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3234. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Regulations Officer, Office of Chief Counsel, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Indefinite Delivery and Indefinite Quantity Contracts for Federal-Aid Construction [FHWA Docket No.: FHWA-2018-0017] (RIN: 2125-AF83) received January 18, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-3235. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Regulations Officer, FHWA, Office of Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Program for Eliminating Duplication of Environmental Review [Docket No.: FHWA-2016-0037] (FHWA RIN: 2125-AF73; FRA RIN: 2130-AC66; FTA RIN: 2132-AB32) received January 18, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-3236. A letter from the Director, Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Schieber v. Commissioner, T.C. Memo. 2017-32 T.C. Docket No. 21690-14 [Action On Decision: AOD-2021-01 (AOD-105860-20)] received January 11, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC-3237. A letter from the Director, Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — 2021 Required Amendments List for Individually Designed Qualified and Section 403(b) Plans [Notice 2021-64] received January 11, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC-3238. A letter from the Director, Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Guidance on Single-Employer Defined Benefit Pension Plan Funding Changes under the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 [Notice 2021-48] received January 11, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC-3239. A letter from the Director, Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Automatic method change procedures for method changes to comply with Sec. 1.451-3 and/or Sec. 1.451-8 (TD 9941) (Rev. Proc. 2021-34) received January 11, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. WATERS: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 2543. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to add additional demographic reporting requirements, to modify the goals of the Federal Reserve System, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 117-228). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. WATERS: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 4590. A bill to require the Federal banking regulators to jointly conduct a study and develop a strategic plan to address challenges faced by proposed depository institutions seeking de novo depository institution charters; and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 117-229). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. WATERS: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1277. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require the submission by issuers of data relating to diversity, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 117-230). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. WATERS: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 6485. A bill to require the Government Accountability Office to carry out a study on the impact of the gamification, psychological nudges, and other design techniques used by online trading platforms, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 117-231). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. OBERNOLTE:

H.R. 6434. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish, within the National Park Service, the Japanese American World War II History Network, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. RODGERS of Washington (for herself and Mr. NEUSE):

H.R. 6435. A bill to provide for the application of certain provisions of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 for fiscal year 2021; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma (for herself and Ms. JACOBS of California):

H.R. 6436. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to address workforce gaps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOWMAN (for himself, Mr.

GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. JONES, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WILSON of Florida, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CARSON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MENG, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. BUSH):

H.R. 6437. A bill to amend the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 to increase the availability of heating and cooling assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BUCK (for himself and Mr. NEGESE):

H.R. 6438. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the site known as "Dearfield" in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BURCHETT (for himself, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. GUEST, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 6439. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide for life imprisonment for certain offenses involving Fentanyl, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 6440. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to establish a grant program for jurisdictions with high rates of violent crime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas (for herself and Ms. TENNEY):

H.R. 6441. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to improve the women's business center program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. FULCHER:

H.R. 6442. A bill to amend section 101703 of title 54, United States Code, to include Tribal Governments and quasi-governmental entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 6443. A bill to accelerate deployment by Taiwan of the asymmetric defense capabilities required to deter or, if necessary, defeat an invasion of Taiwan by the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself and Mr. LAMALFA):

H.R. 6444. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a small parcel of real property at Beale Air Force Base in California to the Three Rivers Levee Improvement Authority; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GOLDEN (for himself and Mr. HAGEDORN):

H.R. 6445. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to require an annual report on entrepreneurial development programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOOD of Virginia (for himself, Mr. PERRY, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. BUCK):

H.R. 6446. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to prohibit the Election Assistance Commission from making pay-

ments under such Act to States and jurisdictions which fail to meet certain standards to protect the integrity and certainty of elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GOODEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. POSEY, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. CARL, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DUNCAN, and Ms. TENNEY):

H.R. 6447. A bill to amend the STOCK Act to require the public availability of financial disclosure forms of certain special consultants and information relating to certain confidential filers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER (for himself, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. CASE, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. DELGADO, Mrs. AXNE, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. VELA, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. SCHRADER, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. BACON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. REED, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. MEIJER, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. KATKO, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. STEIL):

H.R. 6448. A bill to direct the Director of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services of the Department of Justice to carry out a grant program to provide assistance to police departments with fewer than 200 law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 6449. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to enable a State to be reimbursed for child welfare training expenditures made by a nonprofit educational institution in the State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KIM of California (for herself and Ms. CRAIG):

H.R. 6450. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to reauthorize the SCORE program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 6451. A bill to establish the Chiricahua National Park in the State of Arizona as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY:

H.R. 6452. A bill to require the Director of National Intelligence to produce a National Intelligence Estimate on escalation and de-escalation of gray zone activities in great power competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. LIEU:

H.R. 6453. A bill to establish a Housing Stabilization Fund to provide emergency housing assistance to extremely low-income renters and homeowners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself and Mr. CARTER of Louisiana):

H.R. 6454. A bill to clarify the primary functions and duties of the Office of Advocacy of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 6455. A bill to promote, facilitate, and increase two-way trade and investment between the United States and Africa; to the

Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MILLER of Illinois (for herself, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.R. 6456. A bill to prohibit the provision of Federal funds to a local educational agency that requires any student at the schools served by the agency to wear a face covering or be vaccinated against COVID-19; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. MILLER of Illinois (for herself and Mr. GOOD of Virginia):

H.R. 6457. A bill to prohibit the provision of Federal funds to a local educational agency unless in-person instruction is available to all students at the schools served by the agency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina (for himself, Mrs. AXNE, and Mr. TRONE):

H.R. 6458. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the requirement to specify an effective period of a transfer of Post-9/11 educational assistance to a dependent; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 6459. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to redesignate the Office of the Mayor of the District of Columbia as the Office of the Governor of the District of Columbia and to redesignate the Council of the District of Columbia as the Legislative Assembly of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself and Mr. NEAL):

H.R. 6460. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the mandatory delay in making certain refunds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. CURTIS, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER):

H.R. 6461. A bill to require the Federal Government to produce a national climate adaptation and resilience strategy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CARSON, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. POCAN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 6462. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure the solvency of the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund by extending the excise tax on coal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIFFANY:

H.R. 6463. A bill to provide for equal protection of the law and to prohibit discrimination and preferential treatment on the basis of race, color, or national origin in the administration of programs of the Department of Health and Human Services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and Labor, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. NEWMAN, and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 6464. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a presumption of

service-connection for certain veterans with tinnitus or hearing loss, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. WAGNER (for herself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. LATTA, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. BANKS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. KELLER, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. MOONEY, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. ROSE, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. GUEST, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. LATURNER):

H.R. 6465. A bill to prohibit discrimination against the unborn on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia (for herself, Ms. ROSS, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. ADAMS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. MANNING, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 6466. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to remove all adverse credit history related to a loan from the credit history of a borrower who has rehabilitated the loan; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. VAN DUYNE (for herself, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. BRADY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. BABIN, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. FALLON, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. ARRINGTON, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. VELA, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. SCALISE, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. COLE, Mrs. WAGNER, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. MAST, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. EMMER, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. JACOBS of New York, Mr. HERN, Mr. NORMAN, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. CLINE, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. KUSTOFF, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. CARL, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. MEIJER, Mr. KATKO, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mrs. STEEL, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. DUNN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. BANKS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FITZGERALD, Ms. JACOBS of California, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. MCCLAIN, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. VALADAO, Mrs. RODGERS of Wash-

ington, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. STEWART, Ms. FOXX, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. KELLER, Mr. BUCK, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. ZELDIN, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. DONALDS, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. ROY, and Mr. WALTZ):

H. Res. 881. A resolution condemning the heinous terrorist attack on Congregation Beth Israel in Colleyville, Texas, on January 15, 2022; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. MOOLENAAR (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. ISSA, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. FOXX, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. OWENS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. JACOBS of New York, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. BIGGS, and Mr. FITZGERALD):

H. Res. 882. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the week of January 23 through January 29, 2022, as "National School Choice Week"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BUDD (for himself and Mr. NORMAN):

H. Res. 883. A resolution recognizing National Sanctity of Human Life Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SCANLON (for herself, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. CASE, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CARSON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. NORTON, Ms. NEWMAN, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. SCHIFF):

H. Res. 884. A resolution recognizing January 2022 as "National Mentoring Month"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. OBERNOLTE:

H.R. 6434.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the authority to enact this legislation pursuant to the power granted under Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. RODGERS of Washington:

H.R. 6435.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the authority to enact this legislation pursuant to the power granted under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma:

H.R. 6436.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. BOWMAN:

H.R. 6437.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. BUCK:

H.R. 6438.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BURCHETT:

H.R. 6439.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 6440.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 1 of section 8 of article 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas:

H.R. 6441.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

"The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . ."

By Mr. FULCHER:

H.R. 6442.

Congress has the authority to enact this legislation pursuant to the power granted under Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 6443.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 6444.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 14 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H.R. 6445.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8; Clause 1

"The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . ."

By Mr. GOOD of Virginia:

H.R. 6446.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Ninth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution maintains that the American peoples' rights are not limited to those clearly enumerated in the Bill of Rights: "The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

Article I, Section 8 contemplates Congress' authority to " . . . to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof".

By Mr. GOODEN of Texas:

H.R. 6447.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises to pay the debts and provide for the common Defense and general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. Thus, Congress has the authority not only to increase taxes, but also, to reduce taxes to promote the general welfare of the United States of America and her citizens. Additionally, Congress has the Constitutional authority to regulate commerce among the States and with Indian Tribes, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER:

H.R. 6448.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all laws that shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 6449.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII

By Mrs. KIM of California:

H.R. 6450.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 6451.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY:

H.R. 6452.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. LIEU:

H.R. 6453.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 6454.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 6455.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mrs. MILLER of Illinois:

H.R. 6456.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mrs. MILLER of Illinois:

H.R. 6457.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina:

H.R. 6458.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 6459.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 6460.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 6461.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 6462.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. TIFFANY:

H.R. 6463.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the constitution, Amendment XIV, Section 5 of the constitution

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 6464.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 6465.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) section 8 of article I, to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers vested by the Constitution of the United States, including the power to regulate commerce under clause 3 of such section; and (2) section 5 of the 14th Amendment, including the power to enforce the prohibition on government action denying equal protection of the laws

By Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia:

H.R. 6466.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 38: Ms. VAN DUYN.
H.R. 82: Mr. PFLUGER.
H.R. 222: Mr. RYAN.
H.R. 336: Miss RICE of New York and Mr. CROW.
H.R. 748: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 889: Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. BABIN, and Mrs. STEEL.
H.R. 959: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 1012: Mr. JACOBS of New York.
H.R. 1211: Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 1221: Mr. CASTEN.
H.R. 1361: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 1442: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.
H.R. 1527: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.
H.R. 1531: Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida.
H.R. 1577: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 1579: Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. CASTEN, and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 1581: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. ALLRED, and Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.
H.R. 1729: Mr. ESTES.
H.R. 1842: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. VALADAO, and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2037: Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. MANN, Mr. TRONE, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. TIMMONS, Ms. NEWMAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 2144: Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 2230: Mr. McEACHIN and Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 2252: Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. McEACHIN, and Mr. GUEST.
H.R. 2307: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 2351: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.
H.R. 2517: Mr. KUSTER.
H.R. 2525: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 2638: Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 2650: Ms. VAN DUYN.
H.R. 2654: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2709: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 2724: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 2840: Mr. CORREA.
H.R. 2965: Ms. BASS and Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 2974: Mr. TURNER and Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 3053: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 3088: Ms. STEVENS and Mr. BOWMAN.

H.R. 3109: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 3172: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 3207: Ms. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 3488: Ms. MANNING, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. NEWMAN, Ms. TLAI, Mr. WELCH, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. CASE, and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 3525: Mrs. TORRES of California and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 3548: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 3577: Mr. CURTIS, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. JACOBS of New York.

H.R. 3588: Ms. ROSS.

H.R. 3685: Mr. RICE of South Carolina and Ms. VAN DUYN.

H.R. 3704: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 3710: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 3808: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 3962: Ms. ESCOBAR.

H.R. 3982: Mr. CLINE.

H.R. 4130: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 4141: Mr. MANN and Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 4390: Mr. STANTON and Mr. KELLER.

H.R. 4472: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 4598: Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. NEGUSE, and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 4603: Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 4693: Miss RICE of New York and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 4698: Mr. CAREY.

H.R. 4707: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.

H.R. 4942: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 4950: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 5073: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 5118: Ms. STANSBURY.

H.R. 5129: Mr. DELGADO, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CASE, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. KELLER.

H.R. 5136: Mr. CLYDE.

H.R. 5254: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 5255: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 5345: Mr. OWENS and Mr. CURTIS.

H.R. 5388: Ms. BOURDEAUX.

H.R. 5396: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 5428: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 5435: Ms. CHU and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 5485: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 5497: Mrs. STEEL.

H.R. 5502: Ms. BASS and Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 5508: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 5585: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 5590: Mr. GARBARINO.

H.R. 5639: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 5660: Mrs. AXNE.

H.R. 5723: Ms. WILD and Ms. STANSBURY.

H.R. 5731: Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 5754: Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 5761: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 5766: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 5768: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. GARBARINO.

H.R. 5900: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 5963: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 6005: Mr. NORCROSS and Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 6009: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois and Mr. CAWTHORN.

H.R. 6015: Mr. STANTON.

H.R. 6089: Mr. RESCHENTHALER.

H.R. 6107: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 6109: Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 6114: Mr. ESTES.

H.R. 6132: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.

H.R. 6149: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 6161: Mrs. WALORSKI and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 6205: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 6208: Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 6226: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 6227: Mr. STANTON.	H.R. 6319: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.	H.R. 6380: Mrs. HINSON and Mr. FEENSTRA.
H.R. 6238: Mr. COHEN.		H.R. 6395: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 6299: Mr. MANN, Mr. PERRY, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, and Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina.	H.R. 6321: Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina.	H.R. 6396: Mr. EVANS and Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.
	H.R. 6367: Mr. JACOBS of New York, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, and Mr. FITZGERALD.	H.R. 6433: Mr. JACOBS of New York.
H.R. 6312: Mr. CAWTHORN, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.	H.R. 6377: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. PETERS, Ms. DEAN, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.	H.J. Res. 58: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
		H.J. Res. 67: Mr. GARBARINO.
		H. Con. Res. 33: Ms. MANNING.
		H. Res. 850: Mr. JACKSON.